DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 131 FL 011 366

AUTHOR	Gutow, Howard, Ed.
TITLE	Cross Currents: Communication/Language/Cross-Cultural Skills. Volume 5, Number 2.
INSTITUTION	Language Inst. of Japan, Odawara.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	102p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Language Institute of Japan, 4-14-1 Shiroyama, Odawara 250, Japan
JOURNAL CIT	Cross Currents; v5 n2 1978
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingualism; Contrastive Linguistics; *Cultural Traits; Educational Policy; *English (Second Language); Government School Relationship; Interference (Language); Japanese; Japanese Americans; Language Teachers; Language Usage; Learning Theories; *Linguistic Theory; Performance Contracts; Political Influences; Reading Comprehension; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; *Sociolinguistics; Student Teacher Relationship; Teaching Methods; Verbs
IDENTIFIERS	Community Language Learning; *Japan

ABSTRACT

This issue of "Cross Currents" includes the following articles: "The Japanese Concept of Hanashi-Kata and Its Potential Influence on Foreign Language Acquisition" by James R. Bowers; "Linguistic Relativity and Foreign Language Learning" by Ronald Taubitz; "On Being a Sansei English Teacher in Japan" by Ruth Sasaki; "Cross-Cultural Barriers to Reading Comprehension" by Robert N. St. Clair; "Culture Learning Mechanisms in the Context of Community Language Learning" by Paul G. La Forge; "Operations and Their Use in the ESL Classroom" by Thomas A. Winters; "Practical Suggestions for Teaching the English Modals" by James W. Ney; "English and Politics in Japan: Observations on Language Education Reform" by Roger M. Pehlke. The following book reviews by John Fanselow are included: "The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages" by Caleb Gattegno; and "Memory, Meaning and Method" by Earl W. Stevick. Japanese summaries of articles are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187131

CROSS CURRENTS

Communication/Language
/Cross-cultural Skills
Vol. V, No. 2, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Howard Gutow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL011364

ABOUT *CROSS CURRENTS*

Cross Currents is published by the Language Institute of Japan with the intention of contributing to an interdisciplinary exchange of ideas within the areas of communication, language skills acquisition, and cross-cultural training and learning. Although a large proportion of the articles deal with these areas as they relate to Japan and Japanese students, we are also concerned with teaching methodologies, techniques, and general issues which are multicultural rather than culture specific.

Articles submitted for consideration should be typed, double-spaced, with references cited in parentheses in the text by the author's last name, date and page numbers. Footnotes on substantive matters should be typed at the bottom of the page where the footnote appears. Please include a bibliography, a short precis of the article and a short biographical sketch.

Please direct all correspondence to:

General Editor, *Cross Currents*
Language Institute of Japan
4-14-1 Shiroyama
Odawara, 250, Japan

EDITORIAL BOARD

Howard Gutow, Co-Editor
Deborah B. Matreyek, Co-Editor
Joyce Yukawa
Betsy Bedell
Will Adams
Masami Takahashi, Business Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vol. V, No. 2, 1978

Summaries of the Articles (in Japanese) iv

From the Editor ix

1. The Japanese Concept of *Hanashi-Kata* and Its Potential Influence on Foreign Language Acquisition
James R. Bowers 1

2. Linguistic Relativity and Foreign Language Learning
Ronald Taubitz 9

3. On Being a Sansei English Teacher in Japan
Ruth Sasaki 17

4. Cross-Cultural Barriers to Reading Comprehension
Robert N. St. Clair 23

5. Culture Learning Mechanisms in the Context of Community Language Learning
Paul G. La Forge 37

6. Operations and Their Use in the ESL Classroom
Thomas A. Winters 59

7. Practical Suggestions for Teaching the English Modals
James W. Ney 65

8. English and Politics in Japan: Observations on Language Education Reform
Roger M. Pehlke 73

9. Book Reviews
Caleb Gattegno, *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages*
Earl W. Stevick, *Memory, Meaning and Method*
(John Fanselow) 85

Summaries of the Articles

The Japanese Concept of *Hanashi-Kata* and Its Potential Influence on Foreign Language Acquisition

James R. Bowers

日本人の"話し方"についての考え方と外国語学習に与える潜在的影響力について

本論で筆者がいう"話し方"というのは、日本人が言語及び言語学習について持っている考え方や態度を特に指しています。

それは、ある状況下で、話し手がその場にふさわしい言い方がどんなものかを知ってさえいれば、必要な事を表現するのに使う言葉は、すでにきまったものがあるという考え方です。

本論では筆者は、そのような考え方をする為に、多くの日本人は、各種外国語、具体的には外国語としての英語を学習する際、重要な点で様々なむずかしさを経験しているのではないか、そして学生は、そうした考え方をする為、ある筈がないようなきまり文句を必死になって探し、教室では、間違いを恐れて、相対的に消極的になってしまうのではなかろうかと推論しています。

上述のような言語学習に対する姿勢は、考えないで自然に喋れるようになるために必要な長期間にわたっての練習や、意志伝達能力を伸ばすために必要な、ためし、まちがい —— そうした中から学んでいくという練習方法の熟れについても問題を生ぜしめていると思われ、さらに、外国語を学習する際に誰しもが抱く、あのよく研究された当り前と思われる恐怖感を、日本人の場合は、そうした考え故に一層強めていると筆者は考えています。

Linguistic Relativity and Foreign Language Learning

Ronald Taubitz

言語の相対性と外国語教育

言葉が違うということが、実際に人の考えや行動に違いをもたらすものなのか、それとも言葉の違いは、単に生活や考え方の違いを反映したものにすぎないのか —— この設問は、タウビッツ氏の論文に於ける中心課題であり、タウビッツ氏は、言語及び文化の相対性に関する理論の発展のあとを批判的にたどりながら論じています。次に上記設問が、外国語教師にとっては、どんな意味があるのかを考察し、学生がもっと容易にしかも個人的な関わりを最大限持ちながら、異文化的状況へ移行して行けるようにするためには、文化の相対性の中の主観的側面を理解させることが必要であると結んでいます。

On Being a Sansei English Teacher in Japan

Ruth Sasaki

日系三世英語教師として思うこと

筆者は、日系三世米国人の英語教師として日本で経験したことの中から本稿を書き、異文化、異人種間交流に於て、現実に対する正しい理解と相手を思いやる繊細さが必要であると指摘しています。筆者自身“サンセイ”として、多くの日本人が持つ日系米国人に対する偏見を正すことに取組むという特異な立場にいます。

筆者はさらに、英語教師が日本人学生を指導する際、学生が外国人に対して、もっと相手に気をつかい柔軟な態度がとれるよう、かつ又米国の人種問題についての理解を一層深めるよう指導すべく、いくつか提案を行っています。

Cross-Cultural Barriers to Reading Comprehension

Robert N. St. Clair

文化の違いが読解力に及ぼす問題

二カ国語（母国語とある外国語）に通じていて、外国語の方で書かれたものとか、話されたことが、理解できないとき、言語学的障害があったからだと考えられていますが、この言語学的障害が、読むという過程で及ぼす影響は軽微であると言えます。

このことは次のような場合に、特に正しいと言えます。それは例えば、文学や科学といった分野での読むという作業を行う場合で、この場合は、新しい知識を如何に摂取するか、その方法を学ぶということが主な問題であるからです。又、二カ国語に通じている状況で読む作業を行う場合についても、同じことが言えます。その場合の問題は、外国語で書かれたものを読み、その文化に照してどう理解するかを学ぶことであり、さらに新しい知識をどのように使うかということだからです。従って、言語学的障害が問題になるとすれば、それは、外国語学習の際の最も初歩的な段階に限られると言えます。

本論では、二カ国語に通じるようになるためには、新しいテクニックが必要であることを論じています。

Culture Learning Mechanisms in the Context of Community Language Learning

Paul G. La Forge

ＣＬＬ領域での文化学習のメカニズム

文化学習のメカニズムというのは、心理的諒解のもとに行われるグループでの学習体験を言います。合宿、自己紹介、面接等がその例で、この文化メカニズムは、日本社会にある特異な点であり、Community Language Learning（ＣＬＬ）と呼ばれる英語のグループ学習法を用いる際も観察されています。ＣＬＬは、グループとしてお互い助け合い、反省し合う雰囲気の中で行われる学生本位の語学学習法です。

本論の目的は、文化学習のメカニズムをＣＬＬと併せて、実効性のある外国語教育 —— 日本の場合は英語の上達を意味しますが —— に使うことができるということを示すことです。

Operations and Their Use in the ESL Classroom

Thomas A. Winters

"オペレーション"と教室での使い方

本稿で筆者は、"オペレーション"と呼ばれる外国語としての英語の教授法について説明し、その実例と、"オペレーション"を作る際の作り方の一つを示し、"オペレーション"の特色と理論的根拠を紹介しながら、さらに、教師が教室で使えると思われる"オペレーション"のその他の使い方について提言しています。

Practical Suggestions for Teaching the English Modals

James W. Ney

英語モードルを教える際の実際的提言について

ホフマン氏(1966)は、英語のモードル(modal)は、使い方の違いから生ずる意味によって、二つに分けられることを提言しました。このことによって、英語モードルを体系的に教える方法に勝れた基盤がつくられました。

この体系は、ジュース氏(1966)の過去形と現在形を区別する考えが加えられて、一層改善されたものになり、更にアーマン氏の should は mustの過去形であるとする提案によって、体系全体が整理され、かつより実際的なものとなりました。

例としてあげてある会話や場面は、如何にして体系全体が実際的なものになったかを示しています。

English and Politics in Japan: Observations on Language Education Reform

Roger Pehlke

日本に於ける英語と政治、英語教育改革に関する問題点

筆者は、英語教育改革問題について、本論では、教育行政的観点から取り組み、経済界の英語教育に関する改革要求と数々の改革努力についてふれ、現存の教育機構に潜む改革への妨げとなっているものについて一考し、さらに、今後の研究課題としての問題提起を行なっています。

Book Reviews

THE COMMON SENSE OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. Caleb Gattegno. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc., 80 Fifth Avenue, 10011, 1976.

MEMORY, MEANING AND METHOD. Earl W. Stevick. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 68 Middle Road, 01969, 1976.

書　　評

ガッテンニョ氏とスティーヴィック氏は、両氏とも革命的な論の持主で、語学学習と語学教育に関する総合的な理論の構築について論じています。

ガッテンニョ氏は、本来経験論者で、完璧な独自の論体系と語学教育法についての具体的な提言とを示し、スティーヴィック氏は、調査研究者として、自らの研究成果だけでなく、他の教育者の研究成果をも取り入れています。

これら2冊の本は、書き方は全く違いますが、両方とも、語学教師自らについての考えや語学教師と学生との関係等に、意味のある変革を求めようとするそんな語学教師の為に書かれたものと言えます。

FROM THE EDITOR

This issue of *Cross Currents* marks the initiation of a new Book Review section that we hope will become an ongoing, integral part of our journal. The first review featured is by Dr. John Fanselow of Teachers College who spent part of last summer in Japan working with English teachers at LIOJ and other language schools as well as giving a number of workshops. He reviews two books that have been among the major contributions to the field in recent years, *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages* by Caleb Gattegno and *Memory, Meaning and Method* by Earl Stevick.

We at *Cross Currents* see this new section as a means to further expand the scope of the journal and to serve our readers. We welcome reviews of recently published books in the field of language learning/teaching, cross-cultural concerns, and other topics of general interest. The Book Review section offers us an opportunity, not only to introduce new publications, but also to view and evaluate them from a critical perspective.

Cross Currents has grown over the past six years from being primarily an "in-house" journal to one with a wide range of contributors and a growing readership both inside Japan and abroad.

The Table of Contents lists a variety of articles that deal with cross-cultural issues and linguistic considerations in language learning/teaching, practical classroom activities, techniques, and methodologies, and finally, a review of foreign language education reform in Japan from the perspective of educational politics. The diverse geographical locations, and professional backgrounds and interests of the authors represented in this issue are indicative of our growth.

In closing, I would like to express appreciation to all the people involved in the publication of the journal, with a special thanks to Deborah Matreyek, for her hard work and dedication these past two years.

We hope you enjoy this issue and find it useful.

Howard Gutow
Cross Currents

The Japanese Concept of *Hanashi-Kata* and Its Potential Influence on Foreign Language Acquisition

James R. Bowers *

Wilga Rivers in her now classic work, *The Psychologist and the Foreign-Language Teacher*, says of the foreign-language classroom, "Here is fertile ground for frustration, anxiety, embarrassment, humiliation, and their associated emotional states" (Rivers, 1964: 92). Professional foreign-language teachers the world over recognize the essential truth of what she says and its applicability regardless of the native language or culture of the foreign language student. Severe as these problems are for any foreign-language learner, the situation can be further complicated and even reinforced by certain socially determined concepts of language and culture.

Eugene A. Nida gives an example of how this social component affects foreign-language learners when he observes "from case studies that some intelligent missionary students found the learning of a foreign language difficult because of 'their conception (perhaps unconscious) that to learn the language would be to risk a loss of face or more general prestige' " (Rivers, 1964). In this paper I will

*James R. Bowers graduated from Illinois State University with a B. Sc. in Speech and English Education. He arrived in Japan in 1970, and attended graduate school in Japanese History at Sophia University 1975-1976. He is presently an instructor at Meiji University and Aoyama Gakuin University in Tokyo. This paper was presented at the communication Association of the Pacific 10th International Convention, Tokyo, Japan, June 11, 1978.

postulate that in a similar fashion the set of popular concepts of language and social interaction through language held by Japanese and roughly embodied in the Japanese concept of *hanashi-kata* (話し方) exerts a significant negative influence on the average Japanese student of English as a foreign language by reinforcing some of the emotional states described by Rivers above and by mitigating against the use of some widely recognized, effective, audiolingual training techniques. I shall introduce an intermediate, subjectively determined, working definition of this henceforth technical term and describe some of its parameters and logical corollaries. Finally, I shall point out several areas in which such concepts might cause interference for a Japanese student in the process of acquiring English as a foreign language.

Although they do not themselves use the term, Tamura and Goldstein (Goldstein and Tamura, 1975) give a subjectively adequate definition of *hanashi-kata* as "the feeling in Japanese that the words are there to express what is required in any given situation if only the appropriate forms are part of the awareness of the speaker" (Goldstein and Tamura, 1975: 144). Tamura and Goldstein illustrate this concept with the example of *go chiso sama deshita* which is the appropriate phrase to be rendered by each of the guests at the conclusion of a meal. Translated into terms of the American language and culture an equivalent situation would occur if at the end of a meal each of five guests were to respond by saying, "What a delicious meal. Thank you," five times in immediate succession with identical intonation. An American homemaker confronted with such a situation would be shocked and upset. She would question the sincerity of her guests and wonder why they were mocking her. The Japanese hostess, on the other hand, would be delighted at the success of her meal and the sincerity of her guests in responding in the appropriate manner.

Hanashi-kata in the technical sense in which it is used in this paper extends far beyond this simple example of *kimari-monku* (決まり文句), or respectful cliches. It permeates Japanese society at all levels, and its influence can be observed under many guises. There are different language forms for men and women, superiors and subordinates, adults and children, group members and

outsiders.[1] The socially elite are praised for their command of the intricacies of polite and humble language. The less proficient are encouraged to improve.

The concern of the Japanese with *hanashi-kata* is manifested in myriad ways. *Hanashi-kata* schools are almost as ubiquitous as *juku*—private preparatory schools, or English conversation schools. The conflict in Japan's most popular Kabuki play, *Chushingura,* is initiated when the villain refuses to instruct his victim in the right forms of speech to use in the presence of the *Shogun* (Richie, 1963). The most popular Shinto and Buddhist sects express a similar concern for the immutability of the word and the existence of forms appropriate to any given situation. The two most widely accepted sects of Buddhism differ mainly in the phrase which they consider to be the road to salvation, "*Namu amida Butsu*" or "*Namu Myōhōrengekyō*" (Anesaki, 1963: 230). Rote repetition of these phrases is a fundamental precept of their theology.

Hanashi-kata postulates a single or small set of specific words and expressions uniquely appropriate for any given social interaction. These items exist independently of the will and communication desires of the speaker. They are not language tools manipulated according to the needs of the communicant, nor is their selection necessarily dictated by logical choice. The speaker becomes aware of the nuances of a given social situation and consequently of the appropriate language forms by interaction with his predecessors, superiors and contemporaries. He in effect receives his awareness of these matters from them. Once he is aware of the proper forms he uses them verbatim and does not attempt to modify them according to his will or construct new ones by analogy. When one is not yet aware of the proper forms he waits patiently and quietly for that awareness to be transmitted to him. Should he attempt to press matters by asking what the appropriate forms are or by making his own from analogy he risks rebuke and embarrassment for himself and those responsible for developing his awareness. Under such circumstances silence or perhaps a smile is the best recourse.

---

[1] This has been handled extensively in some of the references in the bibliography.

Present linguistic concepts of language postulate a dichotomy between a speaker's language competence (knowledge or potential knowledge of a language) and a speaker's performance (proficiency in the use of the language) (Chomsky, 1965). Linguists are concerned with a speaker's competence. Language teachers are concerned with the speaker's performance.

The transformational-generative model of language posits three major components of language: lexicon (words, morphemes, features and the rules for their combination and application), phonology (the sound system and its rules), and syntax (phrase structure and transformational rules). The syntactical component is the core of this system because it relates the lexical component to the phonological component to produce an infinite number of novel grammatical sentences each with its own unique semantic interpretations (Chomsky, 1965). In short, a language is the set of grammatical rules for producing the sentences of that language. Words play an important but definitely subordinate role as does the phonological component. This theory stresses the creative role of language as a tool for communication.

Language teaching theories which take cognizance of transformational-generative models of language also posit their own dichotomy of a speaker's performance: an autonomous-mechanical component and a cognitive-communicative function (Rivers, 1968). The syntax and phonology as well as much of the lexicon are handled by the cognitive-communicative component. Such theories usually prescribe extensive oral practice of tightly controlled and carefully sequenced sentence patterns in order to internalize the syntactic and phonological components and relegate them to the autonomous system.

If these theories of language and language learning are valid (and there is a rather large body of experimental data to support them), and if the concept of *hanashi-kata* is a viable one then we can anticipate that that concept will foster behavior patterns that interfere in significant ways with the process of acquiring foreign languages in general and English as a foreign language in particular. First of all, *hanashi-kata* gives primacy to the word and formula expressions. It in effect says that language is words and expressions. Further-

more, it says that for any given communication situation a given set of words and expressions already exists. Students who hold such a concept of language could be expected to place a great emphasis on amassing vocabulary, memorizing stock expressions and formulas, and investigating their various social nuances. They would correspondingly place less emphasis on the grammar of the language except when it is conceived of as giving some insight into the social acceptability of particular items. Actual classroom observations reveal that this is indeed the method most frequently followed by Japanese students studying English as a foreign language. *Hanashi-kata* also requires that the individual become aware of these forms in a passive manner, and that he remain silent when in doubt. This is likewise substantiated by actual classroom observation.

Such concepts are in direct contradiction to a view of language which stresses its novelty and creativity, its function as a tool of communication. This is particularly the case when the target language is one like English where a speaker's sincerity and social standing are judged not by his knowledge of the right things to say and how to say them but, rather, by his ability to use the tools of language creatively and inject his unique personality into any given situation. English stresses the novelty of language and uses grammar as the unique device to adapt itself to an ever changing world. The quest for the appropriate word or form except in a rather trivial way is an illusory goal when the target language is English. In fact, it is probably illusory for any language including Japanese.

Moreover, if the key component of any language is its syntactical system, and if manipulation of that syntactical system is handled primarily at the unconscious autonomous level, and if acceptable performance in the target foreign language can only be achieved by doing the extensive oral practice of controlled sentence patterns necessary to internalize that system, then the passive approach to awareness implicit in the *hanashi-kata* view of language acquisition interferes in a direct way with the acquisition of a foreign language. Students are likely to forego oral practice until they feel they have mastered a particular form, but mastery of the particular form requires extensive oral practice.

We are likely to run into the same problem when exercising the

cognitive-communicative skills as well. As Rivers states, all foreign language learners are shy. They are naturally hesitant to respond in the foreign-language classroom. They all dislike making mistakes. The fear of rebuke and embarrassment fostered by *hanashi-kata* serves to reinforce these natural tendencies to an extreme for many Japanese learners. Mastery of communicative-cognitive skills in a foreign language is usually a process of trial and error, however (Rivers, 1968). Students who remain silent in deference to their "lack of awareness" are unlikely to ever master these skills. Add to this the feeling of many native speakers of English that communication itself is a process of trial and error, and we have further grounds for potential frustration.

This paper does not postulate that *hanashi-kata* is the sole or the most important factor affecting the Japanese learner's acquisition of English as a foreign language. There are many other complex factors which are also relevant. Some are social and cultural. Others are psychological or linguistic. An important factor which is seldom touched upon is the influence of previous education and the structure of the educational system itself. The hypothesis of *hanashi-kata* is rather an attempt to begin exploration in a more detailed way of one facet of the social and cultural influences on foreign-language acquisition. Such comments as, "Japanese are shy," or "Japanese don't speak out," whether made by Japanese or foreign teachers of English have little practical value in the search for effective teaching techniques. How often have we used them unconsciously as an excuse for our failures in the classroom? It is all too easy to jump from such remarks to inventing national stereotypes. *Hanashi-kata* too may turn out to be a stereotype, but at least we can frame it in terms subject to rigorous scientific investigation.

This paper does represent an initial statement of the hypothesis and comments on its possible relevance to foreign-language acquisition. Further steps are obviously necessary. The concept of *hanashi-kata* needs to be objectively defined and verified. In this regard I have been constructing a language attitude inventory which I hope to complete and utilize in the near future. Other questions must also be answered. How strongly do young Japanese language learners hold this concept? Most importantly, how well does a

belief in *hanashi-kata* correlate with acquisition of or failure to acquire a foreign language such as English? I hope that the answers to these and other questions will be the subjects of future papers by myself and others.

REFERENCES

1. Anesaki, Masaharu. *History of Japanese Religion.* Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1963.
2. Argyle, Michael. *Social Interaction.* London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1969.
3. Benedict, Ruth. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946.
4. Bowers, James R. *Language and Language Acquisition.* Tokyo: PL Press, 1973.
5. Condon, John C. and Saito, Mitsuko. *Intercultural Encounters with Japan.* Tokyo: The Simul Press, 1974.
6. Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965.
7. Doi, Takeo. *The Anatomy of Dependence.* Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd., 1973.
8. Keene, Donald. *Chushingura.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.
9. Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
10. Langacker, Ronald W. *Language and Its Structure.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.
11. Lester, Mark. *Readings in Applied Transformational Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.
12. Mackey, William Francis. *Language Teaching Analysis.* London: Longman, 1965.
13. Nakane, Chie. *Japanese Society.* Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co. Inc., 1970.
14. Richie, Donald. *Six Kabuki Plays.* Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1963.
15. Rivers, Wilga M. *The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
16. Rivers, Wilga M. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
17. Stanley, Linda. *The Mutual Reinforcement Between the Japanese Language and Its Culture.* Tokyo: Kaibunsha Ltd., 1975.

LINGUISTIC RELATIVITY AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING

Ronald Taubitz *

Teachers of foreign languages, and certainly many of their students, have at one time or another wondered about the apparent incongruities in phonology, syntax, and lexis between the students' native language and the target language under study as well as the cultural differences that are often reflected in them. In addition, they may have asked themselves whether these differences are simply a reflection of different ways of living and thinking or whether they actually condition, in some way, the thoughts and actions of those who use them. Questions of this sort have concerned philosophers for centuries, but only recently have they been treated by anthropologists, linguists, psychologists, and sociologists with the kind of objectivity they need. The purpose of this paper is to review some recent attempts to clarify and explain the problem of linguistic and cultural relativity, and then relate these explanations to foreign language learning in order to show that both language teachers and their students need to understand the complex relations that exist between languages and cultures in order to facilitate the transition from one linguistic cultural world to another.

*Ronald M. Taubitz has been director of the English language program at the Cultural Center of the United States in Madrid and lecturer in English language at the University of Madrid (Complutense) since 1972. From 1970 to 1972 he was Fulbright lecturer at the University of Oviedo.

J. Donald Bowen expressed a degree of reserve with regard to our present state of knowledge concerning linguistic relativity by asking a series of provocative questions:

> It is generally appreciated that languages are highly abstract and complex sets of symbols and relationships. In some strange way the sequences of sounds men make are correlated with the real world we inhabit, but we are still, after all of our serious study, endeavoring to understand how this happens. Since they all do the same job, what do languages have in common? Since they are not intercomprehensible, how are they different? How can the same information be transmitted by any natural language? What is the nature of meaning and how can it be described and understood? Is language a reliable means of describing the real world, or does it somehow extrapolate one system in terms of another? Is reality perceived directly or is it interpreted in terms of language? (Bowen, 1967)

An early attempt to clarify some of these questions was made by Wilhelm von Humbolt in his well-known work, *Uber die Versehiedenheit der Manschilchen Sprachen,* first published in 1836. Specifically, Humbolt felt that language introduces a principle of relativity, " . . . because languages, being unique structures, either help or hinder their speakers in making certain observations or in perceiving certain relations" (Dinneen, 1967: 218).

John B. Carroll noted that later in the historical development of the theory, the hypothesis of linguistic relativity, which presupposes that the thinking of the speakers of a given language is affected by the structure of that language, was advanced again by the American linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf in a famous series of papers published around 1940, just before his death. Carroll and others, as students of Whorf, explored whether there were any ways in which the thinking of certain groups of southwestern American Indians, when using their own language, differed from the thinking of speakers of English. They concluded that it was extremely difficult to discover any such differences:

> The differences we did find were trivial and were certainly unrelated to ability to solve problems or to philosophies. In fact, we were impressed again with that marvelous characteristic of language, its power to express any

> thought and any conception. All languages contain a well-nigh universal set of categories. To be sure, languages differ in the ways they apply and combine these categories, and it is important to observe these differences in making a translation from one language to another. But if there are differences in the thought processes of speakers of different languages, it is most probable that they are attributable to differences in language. (Carroll, 1969: 194-5)

In another work, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, which he edited and introduced, Carroll outlines the early influences on Whorf, and Whorf's influence on succeeding generations of linguists, noting that Whorf's principle of linguistic relativity, or, more strictly, the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (since Edward Sapir most certainly shared in the development of the idea) has attracted a great deal of attention: "One wonders, indeed, what makes the notion of linguistic relativity so fascinating even to the non-specialist. Perhaps it is the suggestion that all one's life one has been tricked, all unaware, by the structure of language into a certain way of perceiving reality, with the implication that awareness of this trickery will enable one to see the world with fresh insight" (Carroll, 1964: 27).

More recently, Muriel Saville-Troike reexamined the linguistic relativity hypothesis and arrived at similar conclusions to those of Whorf. Essentially the same questions are asked about the relationship between language and the other aspects of culture:

> . . . to what extent is a language reflecting a world view . . . or to what extent is language shaping and controlling the thinking of its speakers by the perceptual requirements it makes of them? Does a language which requires social distinctions to be made in order to choose the proper pronominal form (as Spanish and German do for the selection of *tu* versus *Vd.* or *Du* versus *Sie*) force speakers to think in terms of social 'superiority' or 'inferiority'? The answers to these questions remain open to speculation but we can feel quite sure that both sides contain elements of truth, that there is a correlation between the form and content of a language and the beliefs, values, and needs present in the culture of its speakers. (Saville-Troike, 1976: 45-7)

From a sociolinguistic point of view Joshua Fishman has argued that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis may have been superseded by two others:

> One of the major lines of social behavioral science interest in language during the past century has been that which has claimed that the radically differing structures of the languages of the world constrain the cognitive functioning of their speakers in different ways. It is only in relatively recent years and partially as a result of the contributions of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics—that this view has come to be replaced by others: a) that languages primarily reflect rather than create socio-cultural regularities in values and orientations, and b) that languages throughout the world share a far larger number of structural universals than has heretofore been recognized. (Fishman, 1972: 91)

(For a detailed presentation of this latter position see Noam Chomsky's monograph, "Contributions to the Study of Mind: Future.")

John Oller, for one, would not be willing to concede that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has been superseded or replaced, and recently quoted from Albert Einstein's classic radio address entitled "The Common Language of Science" in order to show that while in the early stages language competence is dependent upon the linking of immediate impressions with signs, at later stages language itself plays an important role in shaping thought and conceptualization. Einstein expressed these thoughts in the following way:

> What is it that brings about such an intimate connection between language and thinking? Is there no thinking without the use of language, namely in concepts and concept-combinations for which words need not necessarily come to mind? Has not every one of us struggled for words although the connection between things was already clear? We might be inclined to attribute to the act of thinking complete independence from language if the individual formed or were able to form his concepts without the verbal guidance of his environment. Yet, most likely, the mental shape of an individual growing up under such conditions would be very poor. Thus we may conclude that the mental development of the individual and his way of forming concepts depend to a high degree upon language. This makes us realize to what extent the same language means the same mentality. In this sense thinking and language are linked together. (Oller, 1973: 46)

Finally, Dan I. Slobin, after reviewing the controversy and the arguments on both sides concludes somewhat less dogmatically that

the fate of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is at the present time at an interesting stage of development:

> Today we are more concerned with linguistic universals and cultural universals than with linguistic and cultural relativity. Chomsky has suggested that Whorf was too much concerned with surface structures of languages, while on their deeper levels all languages are of the same universally human character. Cultural anthropologists are looking for ways in which the underlying structures of cultures are alike, and psychologists are moving out of Western culture to cross-cultural studies, in an attempt to understand general laws of human behavior and development. Perhaps in an age when our world has become so small, and the most diverse cultures so intimately inter-related in matters of war and peace, it is best that we come to an understanding of what all men have in common. But at the same time it would be dangerous to forget that different languages and cultures may indeed have important effects on what men will believe and what they will do. (Slobin, 1974: 132-3)

Whether the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can be substantiated or not, the importance and practical implications for foreign language teachers and their students are evident to anyone who has experienced a foreign culture. Just trying to get a taxi driver, for example, to understand where you want to go can be an unnerving experience; and attempting to discover if he has really understood you, since he says he has but continues to drive in the wrong direction, can give a simple ride through town "Kafkaesque proportions which cannot be easily put in perspective by the person who has suffered through them" (Clarke, 1976: 380).

Similarly, whether an individual's reaction to the cultural differences is negative or positive will depend to a great extent on how he has been introduced to them and how effectively the transition has been facilitated. He may reject the new environment altogether, avoiding direct contact with target language speakers as much as possible, or when forced to interact, "attend only to the literal meaning or words, or refuse to study nonlinguistic communication which might clarify the message being transmitted" (Clarke, 1976: 381).

Earl Stevick refers to three ways this transition can be facilitated in his recent work, *Memory, Meaning and Method:* namely through Community Language Learning, the Silent Way, and Suggestology,

which he describes in some detail for those who may not be familiar with them. It is important to note, however, that in every case, attention is focused on the affective needs of the learners, on having them interact with each other and the teacher with a creative personal commitment, and on disarming their defense mechanisms in order to foster productive learning. The present author recently reported on another technique, psychodrama in the classroom, developed by N. Jerome Hall, which could be used to enhance more uninhibited and personally meaningful interaction among students (Taubitz, 1977: 11).

Although new methods will no doubt continue to be developed in the field of foreign and second language learning, there will always remain a fundamental need to understand the essentially subjective nature of cultural relativity as a preliminary to the practical job of helping students learn how to pay a hotel bill or take a taxi in a foreign country. Teachers should be prepared to help their students not only understand the language under study, but also make the transition from one cultural system to another with the least possible trauma and the greatest possible personal involvement.

REFERENCES

1. Bowen, J. Donald. "Introduction." *Semantic Theory: A Linguistic Perspective.* By Don L. F. and Alleen Pace Nilsen. Rowley: Newbury House, 1975.
2. Carroll, John B., ed. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Mass.: MIT Press, 1964.
3. "Language and Psychology." *Linguistics.* Ed. A. A. Hill. Washington, D.C.: USIA, 1969.
4. Chomsky, Noam. "Linguistic Contibutions to the Study of Mind: Future." *Language Thinking.* Ed. Parveen Adams. Suffolk: Penguin, 1972.
5. Clarke, Mark A. "Second Language Acquisition as a Clash of Consciousness." *Language Learning.* (Vol. 26, no. 2) December, 1976.
6. Dineen, Francis P. *An Introduction to General Linguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
7. Fishman, Joshua A. *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction.* Rowley: Newbury House, 1972.
8. Oller, John W., Jr. "Some Psycholinguistic Controversies." *Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher.* Rowley: Newbury House; 1973.

9. Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Foundations for Teaching English as a Second Language.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
10. Slobin, Dan I. *Psycholinguistics.* Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1974.
11. Stevick, Earl W. *Memory, Meaning and Method.* Rowley: Newbury House, 1976.
12. Taubitz, Ronald. "Psychodrama in the Classroom: An Experiment." *TESOL Newsletter. Vol. XI, no. 3,* June, 1977.

On Being a Sansei English Teacher in Japan

Ruth Sasaki *

Much has been written about the experiences of *gaijin* in Japan, most of it by Caucasians who are tired of being stared at or accosted on the street by mocking "haros." But little, if anything, has been written about the experiences of those *gaijin* "in disguise" –Sansei Americans of Japanese ancestry, who come to Japan, like others, out of curiosity. I know there are lots of us here, checking out this never-never land that our grandparents left so many years ago.

Being a Japanese-American in Japan presents a radically different set of problems from those encountered by Caucasian *gaijin*. A Caucasian is assumed to speak English (not German, Italian, Russian, etc.) and to speak no Japanese; nor is s/he expected to be familiar with Japanese customs. Many foreigners claim this to be a form of either racism or cultural chauvinism on the part of the Japanese. However, imagine what it would be like for foreigners if Japanese people expected them to be fluent in Japanese and knowledgeable and respectful of Japanese customs!

This is nearer to my situation. My Japanese is very limited, and

*Ruth Sasaki graduated from the University of California at Berkeley with an A.B. in English Literature and also attended the University of Kent in England. She is currently teaching at the University of California at Berkeley, having recently returned from Japan where she taught for two years at the Language Institute of Japan.

yet I am expected, on sight, not only to speak Japanese fluently, but to behave as a Japanese, in short, to be Japanese. When these expectations are not fulfilled (i.e., when I don't understand what's being said), the Japanese are apt to react with impatience (I'm stupid), uneasiness (I'm mentally retarded or otherwise afflicted), or contempt (I'm Korean or Chinese). I find myself having to explain why it is I look "like a Japanese" and yet don't speak the language, and that, in Japanese or English, is no easy task.

Sometimes even after I explain that I'm an American, my appearance speaks louder than my words, and I am still expected to behave as a Japanese. If I attempt to say something in Japanese, some Japanese people will take offense if I haven't been polite enough, whereas if a Caucasian attempted the same thing, they would beam and say *Jōzu!* ("Excellent!").

You may ask why a person like me who speaks little Japanese came to Japan in the first place. Am I not simply asking for trouble? It would certainly seem so, for I could remove myself quite easily from an uncomfortable situation by going home to America. Yet I feel perhaps the effects of such an escapist tactic would be, in the long run, far more uncomfortable. Certain realities must be faced, and I have come to realize, since leaving the small world of my childhood, that Japan is a skeleton in my closet. When Japanese economic policies become unpopular with Americans, it is my father's business that suffers from the boycott of Japanese goods. When Japanese whaling practices are criticized in American schools, it is my nieces and nephews (fourth generation Americans) who are called names by other children. Americans deplore the World War II relocation of Japanese-Americans when Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, and yet the kind of thinking that enabled that injustice to occur still exists. Protesting our innocence doesn't seem to do the trick. I could easily hate Japan as the shadow that looms over my life, but I think I would be missing out on a lot that Japanese culture has to offer. Besides, I don't want to hate Japan. So, into the lion's den.

Once in the lion's den, I find myself having to explain what I am constantly. Every month I meet a new group of students, and they all seem to ask me, one by one, to define myself. My vision of

relating to people as one human being to another suffers as Japanese and Americans both try to figure out where to put me – am I more Japanese, or more American?

I was surprised to discover that few Japanese seem to be aware of the existence of Japanese-Americans. The concept seems to be a difficult one to grasp, and my racial constitution seems to be a matter of great importance, as students always zoom in on that issue first, and sometimes, only. Perhaps this morbid fascination with race is due to the fact that Japan has been such an overwhelmingly homogeneous society for such a long time. Whereas in America people tend to deliberately avoid mentioning a person's race (it being a "touchy" subject), and keep their speculations to themselves until they know the person better or the person herself broaches the subject, in Japan people jump right in with naive abandon. I have been approached by total strangers on the opening day of the term, who blurt out as a way of introduction: "Are you half?" The first time this happened, my mouth must have dropped open. I'm sure I thought the person extremely rude. I even thought of retorting, "Half what?" and would have felt completely justified in returning the rudeness.

It took several instances of being asked this very same question before I realized something very important. It must have struck me when a very pleasant-looking young woman student (of whom it was impossible to think any ill) approached me and asked the same old question. I realized that "half" is the quite acceptable Japanese-English term for a person of mixed blood, and that people who asked me if I was half 1) weren't necessarily terribly rude, and 2) were definitely not American. This sounds pathetically obvious, and yet there it was: I had been judging Japanese people by American cultural and linguistic standards. It was a simple matter of a cultural misunderstanding. In America, at least in the past, it was a definite minus to be a "half-breed," the product of 'miscegenation,' whereas in Japan, or so Japanese people tell me, being 'half' is a rather glamorous thing to be, as many children of Japanese and Caucasian parents become celebrities on television. Therefore, approaching someone with the question, "Are you half?" might be considered a compliment.

The realization of this cultural difference enabled me to stop feeling bad and take definite action. I still had a problem in that I am not 'half,' and once I explained what I wasn't, I still had to explain what I was. But as an English teacher, it was my duty to correct students' English, and what kind of mistake could be worse than offending a person you're trying to communicate with? It was my duty to explain 1) why not to use the word 'half,' 2) why not to ask the question at all (in America I believe one would never ask a person if he or she had mixed blood, especially as a first question), 3) what a Japanese-American is, and 4) if the student absolutely cannot quell his/her curiosity, that asking "Are you Japanese-American?" or "Are you Japanese?" is much better than asking "Are you half?" It's also a good opportunity to introduce some useful gambits for prefacing delicate questions, for example, "If you don't mind my asking . . . ." I have been approached by students who ask: "If you don't mind my asking, were you born in Japan?" Even though the conception is mistaken, the impression that the student is sensitive about my sensitivity disarms me enough to be able to have a very open conversation.

Intonation and phrasing are things that can be dealt with, and I hope, are dealt with, by all English teachers. I wish I had a Japanese teacher who would iron out those blunt forms and unwittingly offensive intonation patterns of mine which make Japanese people think I'm some kind of illiterate, disrespectful barbarian.

Of course a major part of my difficulties in Japan arise from the conviction of Japanese people (and not only Japanese people) that "American" is synonymous with "Caucasian." The whole world gives lip service to the heterogeneity of American society, yet when confronted by a Japanese face proclaiming itself in native speaker English to be American, many systems short-circuit. The people of the world are not totally to blame for this misconception, as Americans themselves until recent years supported it in the media and textbooks.

As an English teacher in Japan, I have done small things wherever possible to subvert this misconception. My greatest argument, of course, is the fact of my existence. Being as it is that all English teachers cannot be Japanese-American themselves, there are still

things that can be done to provide students with a more realistic picture of American society. The following are some tactics I have employed to that purpose:

1) Textbooks tend to cling to the good old 'American' names like Jones, Winters, Paine, etc. I have made it a special point to "ethnicize" the names I use in the classroom. I don't know any Joneses or Paines, but I do know a lot of Wongs, Garcias, Inouyes, Goldbergs, and Bakowskys. In having students practice dialing directory assistance to ask for telephone information, I have them use the San Francisco Telephone Directory, and students are often amazed to find four pages of Lees, as well as forty-five Tanakas, not to mention nineteen Sasakis.

2) Our school is fortunate enough to have a videotape machine, and a limited but excellent selection of American films. My teaching partner and I have used two films in particular with advanced classes. We spend forty minutes every day covering a five to ten-minute segment of the film, working thoroughly to dig out language and cultural information as well as plot. The two films we have found to be very successful as experiences which promote cross-cultural awareness are *In the Heat of the Night* and *The Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman,* both dealing with race relations in the South.

There have been upon occasion students who refuse to believe that my English is as good as a Caucasian's. One student asked my teaching partner if I had a Japanese accent. I asked him if he thought so, and he replied that he couldn't tell, but that he thought the Japanese "inability" to pronounce certain English sounds was genetic, and would therefore apply to me. I told him that I was sorry but he couldn't use that as an excuse, as the reason he had trouble with those sounds was not that he was Japanese but that he'd been speaking *Nihongo* all his life. He took it well.

I suppose the most important thing I've learned from my experiences in Japan is how to make seeming disadvantages work to everyone's advantage. If a student creates a bad first impression on me I can tell him so and help him create a better one next time. Also, being a Japanese-American puts me into a rather special position in that I challenge people's expectations. My existence shatters

the belief that 'American' equals 'Caucasian.' Many students have approached me with special interest, and I've had some fantastic discussions with them about racial discrimination in Japan and America, Asian-American history, the Civil Rights Movement, etc. Of course, there are people who don't like to have their expectations challenged, and they react to me as if I were some sort of mutation. What can I say but *Shikata ga nai*—it can't be helped. There's only so much one person can do.

My experiences have seemed at times to be nothing but an exercise in frustration and futility, a constant battering of my head against a wall of ignorance. This month, however, two students approached me separately on the first day of term and asked me, 1) "Are you a Sansei?" and 2) "Are you a Nikkei-American?" It turned out that both of them had Sansei English teachers in their hometowns before coming to this school. So perhaps I should view our cross-cultural efforts not as a constant battering, but rather as the action of a continual flow of water over a very solid rock. It's a slow process, but by no means futile. I look forward to the day when students' first question to me will be not, "What are you?" but the kinds of questions they ask other teachers.

Cross-Cultural Barriers to Reading Comprehension

Robert N. St. Clair *

LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE

Much of the literature in bilingual literacy assumes that when one fails to comprehend that which is written or spoken in another language it is because of linguistic interference. This underlying assumption is a natural outgrowth of the structuralist movement in which the overt patterns of sounds, word shapes, and word order were represented within a framework of contrasting structures (Bloomfield, 1933). This approach to cross-cultural interference is readily apparent in the writings of Charles C. Fries (1945; 1962) and Robert Lado (1957). Both of these scholars have been trained within the structuralist tradition and have been most influential in convincing language teachers that when conflicts occur across languages they naturally result from differences in linguistic codes. Hence, they are largely responsible for the rise and development of a new field of language pedogogy, contrastive linguistics, which has set the tone for the construction of language textbooks (Dacanay, 1067).

---

*Dr. Robert N. St. Clair is an associate professor in the Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics at the University of Louisville in Kentucky and also co-editor of *LEKTOS*, a publication of the Linguistics Department there. He is involved in the interdisciplinary approach to problems of literacy.

When the new research mode of transformational grammar came into its own, it provided a new focus on linguistic interference (Temperley, 1961). This transition emerged in the form of error analysis (Richards, 1971; 1974). Rather than concentrate on points of contrast between different language systems, the new theory advocated an interesting reformulation of the interference hypothesis. It argued, for example, that language should be studied as a process and that errors are best understood when they are viewed as the products of underlying rules and their systematic differences across languages (Corder, 1967). Although this new focus requires a radical shift from one research paradigm to another, this change is deceptive. The assumption of structural interference is endemic to transformational theory. The previous model assumed that the locus of the interference was to be found in the overt patterns of linguistic expression. The neo-structuralist model has merely shifted its focus to the rules which underly these disparities. In both cases, the assumption of linguistic interference continues to operate.

What is significant about this hypothesis of interference for the reading teacher in a cross-cultural context is that linguistic interference is considered to be one of the major barriers to reading comprehension. This is the basic assumption behind the phonics approach (Cordt, 1965) with its concern for minimizing the interference of grapheme to phoneme patterns through such techniques as word attack skills and blending exercises. It is also the model that Leonard Bloomfield (1961) and his student, Charles Fries (1962), advocated in their roles as language educators.

In this essay, it is argued that the role which linguistic interference plays in the reading process is minimal. This is especially true of reading in the content areas where the major problem is one of learning how to process new information; and, it is also true of reading in the context of bilingual literacy where the problem is one of learning how to define what is read within a new cultural context. If problems of linguistic interference occur, they are limited to the most rudimentary stages of language acquisition. What is significant about these findings is that it demonstrates the need for new techniques for bilingual literacy.

INFERENCES

With the advent of psycholinguistics, reading research has shifted away from a concern with correspondences between sounds and letters and has moved toward a focus on reading for meaning (Smith, 1971; 1973). The previous approach was based on the assumption that communication between people took place only when a message was transmitted or channeled from a speaker to a listener in the form of a linguistic code (Singh, 1966). The message was encoded into the established patterns of the language, and it was subsequently decoded by a listener who fully retrieved the message by breaking the code. What is significant about this new focus on reading for meaning is the realization that linguistic communication cannot be reduced to the processes of encoding or decoding. It requires the use of tacit information which transcends the written code. It requires the use of background information which the native speaker of a language brings with him or her to the printed page (Farnham-Diggory, 1972).

Some insight into the nature of tacit knowledge can be found in the process of inferencing. In his study of natural conversations, Garfinkel (1967) has noted that what is actually said is not as important as what is implied or inferred from the speech act. Most language use, he argues, involves going beyond the overt forms of speech and requires the use of tacit knowledge which both parties share and which forms the basis for social interaction. To illustrate his point, he recorded numerous conversations in an informal setting and found that in each instance there was usually no coherent transition in meaning or in linguistic form in the dialogue from one person's utterance to the other's. Some questions, for example, were never answered. Some statements, in addition, were abruptly interrupted with sentences which had no coherent relationship to the conversation. Although this interaction may appear to be rather chaotic to the external observer, it was both coherent and logical from the perspective of those involved. What this research demonstrates is that the elliptical nature of conversations is typical of ordinary language use.

What is significant about the work of Garfinkel (1967) and his

fellow ethnomethodologists is that it directly challenges the assumption that linguistic misunderstanding is intrinsically related to disparities in patterned expressions or the rules which underly them. It also challenges the conventional wisdom of information theory with its focus on encoding and decoding procedures. It argues, instead, that the shared assumptions and expectations of the participants in a conversation form the basis for human communication. The speaker approaches the conversation with a set of assumptions. These may be based on past experiences which are characteristically associated with the context involved or they may be based on a repertoire of sociolinguistic skills. The hearer also approaches the context with a set of expectations. If both of these parties share their assumptions and expectations, this results in successful communication. If they do not, the result is misunderstanding or semantic distortion. In the case of the conversational interaction studied by Garfinkel (1967), the participants in the speech act understood one another and were able to draw correct inferences from their ephemeral verbal interchange because of their shared assumptions and expectations. For those who remained outside of this interaction, however, the situation seemed chaotic and unstructured and this was because they lacked the same set of assumptions and expectations upon which to define the context of the situation. Considering the fact that most conversations are about what is not said, the crucial factor in the communicative process has to be the inferencing procedure itself. How are inferences made? Where do they come from?

DEFINING THE SOCIAL SITUATION

Linguists have always been aware of the context of the situation. This term was coined by Bronislav Malinowski (1922). He found it necessary to counteract the prevailing linguistic practice of hypostatization in which language patterns were abstracted from the context in which they were uttered. He argued instead that sentences can only be understood when they are placed in the context of the situation in which they occurred. Raymond Firth (1957) drew on this use of sociolinguistic context for his own

theories of language and modified this concept to include a repertoire of registers which characterize everyday language use. This rich sociolinguistic insight into language use continues to play a major role in the Firthian tradition of language education. Unfortunately, American linguists remain unaware of this contribution and its significance (Langendoen, 1968). This is particularly true of sociolinguists who delight in their discovery of "code-switching" phenomena. They fail to recognize the fact that this concept is merely a restatement of the "context of the situation" which dominates British linguistics.

Although the use of language and its taxonomy of contextualization does provide significant information, it fails to explain why the process occurs and how it is related to other aspects of linguistic behavior. The answer to these questions are best sought from an interdisciplinary perspective. This concept, for example, also plays a major role in the field of sociology (McCall and Simmons, 1966), and is used to explain how people differ in their perception of the same objective context. This is particularly true of the school of symbolic interactionism (Faules and Alexander, 1978) where differences in the social construction of reality have been most clearly articulated. As Faules and Alexander (1978) note, people never really come in direct contact with reality. They are socialized differently and bring those perspectives with them in their assessment of a situation. This process of naming or labeling the objects that one perceives is called "the definition of the situation." It is a process that recognizes the symbolic nature of language in which events are symbolized so that they may be shared with others. These symbolized events are defined within the cultural and social realities which the individual brings to the context of interaction. When the events which surround a person are related to his or her belief system, it is meaningful. When they do not concur with one's social construction of reality, they are modified or distorted to accommodate the larger frame of ideas. When this is not possible, one's most cherished beliefs are threatened and cognitive dissonance results (Festinger, 1967). To reduce this form of mental discomfort, one could employ certain coping strategies. These range from denying the existence of the event as being real to distorting it to

conform to one's limited range of experience.

Whereas the linguists were content to merely list the various uses of language within a social framework, symbolic interactionists were compelled to seek greater explanatory power for their structurally related concept. They view individuals as being socialized into a multiplicity of roles which cluster around a coherent view of self. When approaching a new context, one draws on these tacit assumptions and expectations. They provide the basis from which sociolinguistic inferences are derived. What is significant about this concept of defining the social context of a situation is not that it adequately explains how language is used in face-to-face conversations, but it also provides insight into how language is employed in the sociology of reading.

READING AS SOCIAL INTERACTION

When readers approach the printed page, they come armed with a host of pre-conceived notions about what is to occur. In their minds, they may already know how the story is about to unfold or how it will end. They are sensitive to the kinds of responses which are appropriate to the situations involved. In addition to this tacit use of social knowledge, these readers impose meanings on new structures, impute reasons for the various actions of the characters in the plot, and they draw various inferences which emerge as interpretations of the events reported in the text. These readers arrive at conclusions from a scattering of clues embedded throughout the text. They interact with the text. This form of social interaction is not a unique feature of the reading process, but represents a normal characteristic of symbolic interaction through the medium of language (Hewitt, 1976).

Social interaction is situated in time and space. It takes place in a social container or situation that has been either previously defined by the reader upon the text or which emerges from the uncertainty of the interaction. This definition of the reading context is important because it provides the basic component of tacit or prior knowledge from which the active process of inferencing emerges and from which comprehension strategies derive. Since life is ex-

perienced from a multiplicity of experiences and perspectives, the reader may view a situation from a range of contexts. In reading a story, for example, comprehension will always take place. It may not be what the author originally envisioned, but nevertheless each reader will arrive at some level of understanding of the text based on his point of view as a member of a certain sex, racial grouping, class structure, or social group. These perspectives not only condition the nature of the interaction, but they also limit its view of knowledge. This realization of reading as a social process is just beginning to have an impact on language education. It is this phenomenological perspective which underlies the work of Aaron Cicourel and his colleagues in their assessment of standardized reading tests (Cicourel, et alia, 1974). If knowledge is socially constructed and its accessibility is socially distributed, then it stands to reason that not every person will read the same passage with the same depth of understanding nor with the same kinds of inferential structures. As a consequence, Cicourel and his colleagues found it necessary to supplement standardized tests with other forms of social inquiry.

READING AND THE CONTENT AREAS

In teaching students how to read in such content areas as literature and science, teachers are perplexed. They view the students with suspicion. According to their records, these students have demonstrated their ability to read. However, in their daily encounter with reading in a new content area, these students profess great difficulty. When this history of events are viewed within the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, the perplexity of this situation is soon resolved. The problem is not one of being able to read in the physiological sense of that term, but one of being unable to adequately assess new information. When a subject matter is new to students, they have difficulty in evaluating just what is important and what is not. The result is that everything becomes important. Such a strategy creates a state of cognitive clutter. This process is reminiscent of the common experience of taking lecture notes in an introductory class which lies outside of one's area of

expertise. At the beginning, one frantically attempts to write down everything that is said in fear of missing any information which the professor may impart. Obviously, everything is not of equal importance during a lecture, but the neophyte is unaware of this. Some even tape their lectures and laboriously transcribe them into lecture notes. However, as the student becomes more and more aware of the focus of the course, there will be less cognitive clutter and the note-taking will begin to become more structured. As the course draws to a close, the student may go through an entire lecture without even recording anything more than a list of self reminders of the content of the lectures. For the intellectually aggressive student, the process may involve a critical reply or a commentary of the events. This same state of affairs can be found in reading in the content areas. When the subject matter is new the student feels obliged to read every single word. Later, when the period of cognitive clutter has passed, the more judicious reader will be able to read more intelligently and interact on some of the ideas presented in the text while subordinating others.

Since the knowledge which the students bring with them to the reading of a text is socially constructed and may differ substantially from one student to the next, this places a special burden on reading teachers. They must provide their students with an understanding of the tacit knowledge upon which the texts are written. They must teach them how to evaluate their textbooks from the perspective of the author. This can be done by way of introduction to a new field of knowledge by both the teacher and the text book writer. Unfortunately, the increasing cost of printing has led publishers to drastically reduce books in the content areas in size. They have shortened the introductions or have eliminated them entirely. As a consequence, this has placed an added burden on the reading teacher who must recreate this information for the students. When this is not done the problem of cognitive clutter creates a state of functional illiteracy and acts as a counter productive force against reading comprehension.

BICULTURAL LITERACY

If people differ in how they define a social situation within the

same cultural experience, this problem is substantially compounded with problems of bilingual literacy when communication takes place across cultures. The student who is learning English as a foreign language, for example, is not only faced with some difficulty in decoding in an unfamiliar language, but that student is also plagued by the problem of interpreting what is read within a new cultural context. In a sense, this problem is comparable to the difficulty which native speakers of a language face in reading in a new content area. However, for the foreign student, this process is one of bilingual dissonance and cognitive clutter. The latter constantly occurs as each new facet of code switching is uncovered; and, the former occurs when an adequate understanding of a new set of events either directly or indirectly threatens one's own concept of self, religion, family, education, employment, history, and nation.

The nature of bicultural literacy and the role that it plays in the language classroom is best understood by way of example. Consider a story in which two businessman are concluding a transaction across cultures (Okada and Okada, 1973). Each of these men participating in a commercial venture acts as a representative of his own culture. They each define the context of their situation differently. For the American businessman, the situation may be defined in terms of the business ethic of social Darwinism (Hofstadter, 1955). This tradition grew out of the philosophy of Herbert Spencer near the turn of the century. It was based on the Darwinian assumption that human beings are in a competitive struggle for superiority and social survival. It is this philosophy which allows the American to be ethnocentric and ruthless and uses this as a justification for self aggrandizement. Along with this ideological framework, the American will approach the situation with other assumptions about how one behaves in public. He will tend to joke, display carelessness about certain aspects of life which are not of interest to him commercially, and will profess an open ignorance about the socio-political history of his host's nation (Kato, 1959). The other partner in the business transaction is Japanese and will also be commercially oriented, but he will have a different set of assumptions about how business is to be transacted. His familiarity with the concepts of Herbert Spencer may differ substantially (Harrison,

1972) and may be related to the popular ethic of *shingaku* which was established during the Tokugawa period when the masses were politically socialized to place service above one's self in order that they may remain unselfish and faithful to their assigned works (Minami, 1971). Furthermore, he may profess a form of ethnic solidarity which is different from that of his American counterpart (Ishida, 1974).

What is significant about these cultural differences is that each represents a framework upon which social interaction is defined. When the American student reads a passage in a text about a business transaction, the interpretation of this information will be different from that of the Japanese student who reads it in the second language classroom. The American student will read the passage and draw certain predictable inferences about how the transaction is supposed to be carried out. This process of inferencing will also distort the image of the Japanese businessman and he will be seen as having the same business ethic and sense of public behavior as his American counterpart. Similarly, when the Japanese student reads such a passage the inferences which he draws upon will be different. He will correctly interpret the behavior of his country's representative, but will understandably distort the social intent and actions of the American. To add to the complexity of this situation, if the story were written by an American, the distortion would be cast within the cultural and social traditions of the United States. However, if the story were written by a Japanese, the interpretation of the events would be cast in a different light and would express the Japanese patterns of culture.

It is important to realize that when bicultural literacy fails, it is not a matter of linguistic interference. Both businessmen are speaking the same language and the story is cast in the same language. The problem occurs with the readers. They are living and thinking in different social realities. Teachers of English as a foreign language should realize just what this means. They should not conclude too quickly that their students cannot read because of linguistic interference. The problem is not necessarily a lack of vocabulary or a need for more word attack skills. The problem may be one of cognitive clutter and in this regard it is comparable to

students who have difficulty in processing new information. Or, the problem may be one of bicultural dissonance in which the tacit knowledge of one's own culture continues to define the context of the situation. In this case, what is needed is an understanding of how the new culture operates. This can be accomplished by means of orientation programs and other forms of social awareness.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It has been argued that linguistic interference is the major barrier to cross-cultural understanding. This assertion is challenged within the theoretical framework of ethnomethodology. The problem, it is argued, is one of processing new information. Students need to know how to draw inferences when confronted with new subjects or new cultural experiences. These inferences emerge from the phenomenological perspective that one brings to the reading context. It depends on how they define the social context of a situation and on the kinds of interactional strategies that they have in their repertoire of communicative coping skills.

There are many implications that this new framework has for language teachers. One, they should become more sophisticated in dealing with linguistic interference and be able to recognize when a problem emerges from the linguistic context of a verbal code or the social context of human interaction. Second, when reading problems emerge from reading in the content areas, the teacher should have contingency plans which directly relate to unraveling the tacit knowledge which accompanies the new subject matter. Third, when reading problems result from bicultural factors, the teacher should inquire into the assumptions which the foreign student has about the reading passage and provide cross-cultural insights and explanations. Fourth, since the resolution of cognitive clutter varies from subject to subject and from one social context to another, the reading teacher should learn to become more tolerant of students who are having difficulty. It would be incongruous to conclude that such students who are slow in one of the socio-historical areas of knowledge are also lacking in other aspects of language learning. Fifth, given the fact that students differ in their

level of assessment in reading in the content area and in reading in a bilingual and bicultural context, more sophisticated testing procedures are needed to determine proficiency, vocabulary development, and syntactic complexity. Also, new procedures are needed to assess reading comprehension across a respectable range of content areas and cultural contexts.

The greatest barrier to reading comprehension in a cross-cultural context is the inability to process new information. Whether such an ability could be developed globally as an awareness factor remains to be seen. However, at this stage of research within the paradigm of symbolic interaction, the problem remains at the level of ascertaining the factors which emerge as significant in the sociology of reading.

REFERENCES

1. Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language.* N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1933.
2. Bloomfield, Leonard and Barnhart, Clarence. *Let's Read.* Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1961.
3. Cicourel, Aaron, et alia. *Language Use and School Performance.* New York: Academic Press, 1974.
4. Corder, S. Pitt. "The Significance of Learner's Errors." *International Review of Applied Linguistics,* 1967, 5, 161-170.
5. Cordt, Anna D. *Phonics for the Reading Teacher.* N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
6. Dacanay, F.R. *Techniques and Procedures in Second Language Teaching.* Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publishing, Inc., 1967.
7. Farnham-Diggory, S. *Cognitive Process: A Psychological Preparation for Teaching and Curriculum Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
8. Faules, Don and Alexander, Dennis. *Communication and Social Behavior: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.
9. Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1967.
10. Firth, Raymond, ed. *Man and Culture: An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislav Malinowski.* London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.
11. Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1945.
12. Fries, Charles C. *Linguistics and Reading.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

13. Garfinkel, Harold. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
14. Harrison, John A., ed. *Japan*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1972.
15. Hewitt, J.B. *Self and Society: A Symbolic Interactionist Social Psychology*. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.
16. Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1955.
17. Ishida, Eiichiro. *Japanese Culture: A Study of Origin and Character*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 1974.
18. Kato, Hidetoshi, ed. *Japanese Popular Culture: Studies in Mass Communications and Cultural Change*. Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle, 1959.
19. Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
20. Langendoen, D. Terence. *The London School of Linguistics: A Study of the Linguistic Theories of B. Malinowski and J.R. Firth*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T., 1968.
21. Malinowski, Bronislav. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: G. Routledge, 1922.
22. McCarthy, George J. and Simmons, J.L. *Identities and Interactions: An Examination of Human Association in Everyday Life*. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1966.
23. Minami, Hiroshi. *Psychology of the Japanese People*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
24. Okada, Barbara T. and Okada, Nancy J. *Do's and Don'ts for the Japanese Businessman Abroad*. N.Y.: Regent Publishing Co., 1973.
25. Richard, Jack C. "Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies." *Language Sciences*, 1971, 12-22.
26. Richard, Jack C., ed. *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. 1974.
27. Singh, Jagjit. *Great Ideas in Information Theory and Cybernetics*. N.Y.: Dover Publication, Inc., 1966.
28. Smith, Frank. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
29. Smith, Frank. *Comprehension and Learning: A Conceptual Framework for Teachers*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
30. Smith, Frank (ed.). *Psycholinguistics and Reading*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
31. Temperley, Mary S. "Transformations in English Sentence Patterns." *Language Learning*, 1961, 11, 125-134.

Culture-Mechanisms in the Context of Community Language Learning

Paul G. La Forge *

Most cultures provide any number of cultural learning mechanisms, which in the context of a pertinent teaching methodology, can be exploited for use in foreign (e.g. English and other) language learning. Cultural mechanisms are types of group learning experiences which are bounded by a psychological contract in the sense described by Egan (1970: 18). Examples of Japanese cultural mechanisms are the social contract, the age-hierarchy, reflection, self-introduction, the club workshop, and so forth. These are characteristic of Japanese society and have been observed during the use of a group approach to English education called "Community Language Learning" (hereafter, CLL). CLL, developed by Charles A. Curran (1972), is a student-centered language learning contract which is enacted in supportive group experience and reflection.

The purpose of this article is to show that cultural learning mechanisms can be used together with CLL for effective foreign language education, which in the Japanese case means the mastery of English. Both in public and private schools, Japanese teachers of

---

*Father La Forge, Assistant Professor, Nanzan Junior College, Nagoya, Japan, is author of *Research Profiles with Community Language Learning* (The Apple River Press, 1975). He holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo. This article first appeared in *Topics in Culture Learning*, Volume 4, 1976, and is reprinted here with their kind permission and that of the author.

English are faced with two tasks at the secondary level of education. During three years of junior high school, the basic grammatical and reading structures must be established. After three years of senior high school, the students must face rigid and competitive university entrance examinations. Therefore, only a pedagogy which reinforces either of the two tasks is acceptable for use inside the classroom. Speaking skills receive little attention on the secondary educational level. A recent trend away from this situation is observable among senior high school students who are beginning to demand more speaking ability of their teachers inside the classroom. Outside the classroom, small groups organized by the students themselves are centering upon the acquisition of proficiency in speaking.

On the university level and beyond, in Japanese companies, priority is gradually being shifted from a textbook-centered grammatical approach to the acquisition of speaking skills. Observable here is the tendency to attack the problems connected with the mastery of English speaking within the context of small peer groups of older and younger members. Much time and energy are being used in this task without the assistance of a pertinent teaching pedagogy (i.e., a practical way of teaching based on sound educational theory). After five years of teaching activity, I have found that CLL is of great assistance both inside and outside the classroom. Without changing the basic structure of the teaching methodology inside the classroom, the introduction of a reflection period (characteristic of CLL and Japanese society) helps the teacher to discover the immediate impact of the day's activity on the students. Outside the classroom, the learning in groups following the cultural patterns of Japanese society can be reinforced with the help of CLL. Therefore, it is the task of this article to show, first, that there are differences between a language learning contract (CLL together with Japanese cultural mechanisms) and behavioristic principles of learning which entail classroom activities such as teacher-centered sentence drilling. A recent example of the latter is the work of Jacobovits and Gordon (1974). Secondly, the CLL contract is enacted in both experience and reflection within the social dimensions of a Japanese value-model proposed by Hirschmeier and

Yui (1975). In the Japanese case, it is possible to classify the cultural mechanisms on the social dimensions of the value-model. Thirdly, some beneficial results of using indigenous cultural mechanisms in the CLL context will be pointed out.

THE CONTRACT

CLL is a social contract in the sense described by Egan (1973: 24). A formal definition of a contract is "an agreement enforceable at law made between two or more persons by which rights are acquired by one or both to acts or forebearances on the part of the other." However, contracts need not be legalistic. The common sense notion of a contract as a free and human agreement between teacher and students is sufficient for this discussion. In Egan's (1970: 26) sense, a contract can be understood as a series of rules which makes a group operative and give it direction. The members agree, either explicitly or implicitly, to follow these rules in order to achieve the purpose of the group. The rules might well change as the group moves forward, but at any stage of the development of the group, a set of rules is operative. Implicit in any group contract are the goals and purposes of the group and the means the group uses in order to achieve these goals.

A contract to which prospective participants subscribe before they enter the group experience can help stimulate the success of the group in various ways. First of all, it defines the group experience and sets it apart from other kinds of group processes. The prospective participants, then, know in general something about the nature of the learning experience. Not only good ethics, but the logic of commitment seems to demand that participants know what kind of group they are about to join. Such clarity of commitment ensures a higher degree of what can be called psychological (participative) rather than mere formal (spectator, non-participative) membership. Second, a contract, in a practical way, makes high visibility rather than ambiguity a reality for the group. High visibility means that the members know what they are getting into. Both the goals and the procedures for attaining those goals are highly visible. Third, a contract outlines the procedures and processes of the

group; that is, it links means with ends. A good contract is not meant to control members or to restrict their freedom unduly. Its purpose is rather to channel the energies of the group toward specific goals.

The concept of a social contract has a long tradition in Japanese culture. Before the advent of the modern school in the Meiji era, education in Japan took place in small groups around a single teacher (Dore, 1965). The contract was made between the student and his teacher. The type of learning experiences as well as details, such as the amount of tuition, were stipulated by the contract. Even today, social groups in Japan still operate in terms of social contracts by which the purpose of the group experience, the expectations, and obligations of the members are clarified, as explained previously. The social contract is a living cultural mechanism of Japanese society which can be used as a valuable tool for modern education.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CONTRACT AND BEHAVIORIST LEARNING

Learning based on a social contract is different from that based on behavioristic principles which rely on teacher-centered pattern practice drilling. Stevick (1974), following a psychological paradigm suggested by Berne (1964) and Harris (1967), has shown that oral pattern practice drilling based on behavioristic learning principles can reduce language learning activities to an ineffective game which is played between teacher and students. Stevick has suggested the creative use of oral drills in order to improve the effectiveness of the learning activities. However, at a deeper level perhaps overlooked by Stevick, learning based on a social contract was suggested by Harris (1967: 162) himself, who wrote:

> The contract is one of the best instruments I know of for assuring consistency in direction and discipline; yet because it is drawn by the Adult, it can be reexamined from time to time by the Adult with the further benefit of keeping it up to date and flexible enough to meet changing realities.

The social contract differs radically from the "Transactional Engineering Analysis" described by Jacobovits & Gordon (1974). Although they use similar terminology, their meaning has nothing in common with Berne or Harris (Jacobovits & Gordon, 1974: 60 & 250). First, the contract is not clearly defined except from the point of view of the teacher, who should be left free to organize his course as he sees fit (Chapter 7). Only a few vague statements (p. 104) refer to "a climate of freedom" created for the students. Secondly, the students are even deprived of their freedom in transactional engineering analysis. Jacobovits & Gordon (1974: 176) have written as follows:

> Disagreeing transactions block out experiential learning. They involve the participants in a sideways motion in which they persevere in a collusion whereby each of them tries to prevent the other from seeing what's going on .... Disagreeing transactions are thus participants' attempts at creating or maintaining inauthencity in the interaction.

Thirdly, high visibility is not characteristic of a transactional engineering group contract. Jacobovits and Gordon (1974: 186) have stated the following:

> Sooner or later, depending on the learner's competence in interaction with the teacher's style, his good will (perseverance) runs out and the teacher is faced with learner resistance. How does he overcome it? Assuming he is not giving up when faced with that problem ... he must find a way to *trick* the recalcitrant learner.

The student, who is not free in the transactional engineering setting, must also sacrifice his integrity to the engineering process by allowing himself to be tricked into "authentic transactions." Jacobovits and Gordon, it seems, have proposed another form of teacher-centered education which departs little from behavioristic teaching practices and methodology. In a recent review of Jacobovits & Gordon, Stevick (1975) has been somewhat more charitable. However, Jacobovits & Gordon have acknowledged their dependence on the behavioristic position:

> Our initial attempt at formulating a theory of communicative competence ... was significantly infuenced by the behavioristic attitude towards the functional interpersonal bases of verbal utterances and we relied heavily on Skinner's functional taxonomy of utterances in terms of the interpersonal and communicative function. (Jacobovits & Gordon, 1974: 241)

STUDENT-CENTERED CONTRACT

CLL is a student-centered contract. This implies a type of learning relationship to the teacher which is different from an engineering relationship. Essential to the CLL contract is "learner space" (Curran, 1972: 91). Because of the knower's greater knowledge, there exists a distance or space between himself and the learner. This space is necessary if one person is to learn from another. But if the knower projects himself into that space, allowing no room in it for the learner, he destroys any opportunity for the learner to expand into it. If the knower uses the space of the learner only to meet his own needs, he will cause hostility and resistance in the learners. Lack of learner space may explain the problems of "teacher-paradox" and "recalcitrant learner" which Jacobovits and Gordon (1974: 185-186) leave unsolved.

In the behavioristic context, the inequality of knowledge between the participants of an instructional dyad gives rise to a teaching process which is inherently manipulative (Jacobovits & Gordon, 1974: 185). In the CLL context, learner space is not only essential to any true learning relationship, but is also a final explanation of what actually occurs when one person tries to learn from another. By a free agreement, the learner makes his space available to the knower, but only so that he, the learner, can grow more and more to fill that space. The learner continually moves closer to the "target," the knowledge of the knower, until he reduces the knower to silence or "nonexistence." This is the final goal of learning according to Curran (1972: 92).

In the CLL classroom, there are no pattern practice drills which are inherently teacher-centered. Instead, the teacher functions as a group leader under a double contract described by Egan (1970: 20) as a "commercial contract" and a "process contract." The

commercial contract stipulates that the teacher be paid by the school for using his professional skills to guide the participants in his classes to better levels of language proficiency. The commercial contract usually assumes his professional competence and allows him to run his class as he sees fit. But the CLL teacher himself has a specific approach to the classroom situation; he has goals in mind and some idea of the means he will employ in order to reach those goals. Thus, the CLL teacher operates within an educational process contract which he himself has devised. The process contract is quite flexible and it changes as the teacher grows in experience. As a condition of the process contract, the teacher may consign the pattern practice to leaders of a number of small groups in his classroom. Alternate members of the groups may become the drillmasters for a specified length of time. Consequently, as a learning exercise, the value of pattern practice drilling is not lost. Under the conditions of a CLL contract, it becomes a student-centered learning experience. In the Japanese case, more effective exercises than pattern practice are learning experiences derived from the culture itself, as we shall see.

Learner space is limited by what has been termed a "member contract" (Egan, 1970: 27). The provisions of a member contract specify the ways in which the members of a CLL group are expected to act during the group experience. For the most part, the member contract is vague. However, CLL groups themselves have made various rules, sanctioned by rewards and punishments, for the optimal fulfillment of the group contract. For instance, a group of Spanish students engaged in learning English once made it a group rule that each person in the group had to say something, at least one sentence in English, during the course of a free English speaking period. As will be shown later, Japanese groups also provide, within the scope of a CLL contract, a series of rules for each member in order to insure the fulfillment of the group goals.

GROUP EXPERIENCE

In a recent book, Hirschmeier and Yui (1975: 44) have analyzed the historical development of Japanese business around a social

value-model with four dimensions: vertical, horizontal, and depth, which means time continuity. The fourth aspect, called "ethics of functional role expectation," was intended to clarify the strength of the unifying principle. The ethics of functional role expectation, according to Hirschmeier and Yui (1975: 52), consist of the external pressures generated by Japanese society on the individual to shape each man's thinking and doing to fit the generally expected social role in which he found himself. In itself, the value-model of Hirschmeier and Yui has nothing to do with foreign language education. However, among a group of Japanese learners, the value-model has application. The CLL contract is enacted in a group learning experience with similar social dimensions, as previous research has indicated (La Forge, 1974). The social dimensions are horizontal and vertical with respect to the teacher. Although the time continuity is much shorter than the periods of Japanese history which were analyzed by Hirschmeier and Yui, still, the continuity of the group life over a semester or a school year is a dynamic factor in the personal development of the participants and of the group itself. If the group operates on a contract which is enacted in meaningful learning experiences and reflections, the living community dispenses knowledge on both its horizontal and vertical dimensions. The ethics of functional role expectation in a Japanese CLL group operate especially through reflection, as will be shown later, to insure optimal fulfillment of the contract by all the participants.

On the vertical dimension, learning occurs primarily between the teacher and the whole group, secondarily, between the teacher and each individual in the group. On the horizontal dimension, learning takes place among the students themselves. Furthermore, because learner space is provided by CLL, students are free, over the time continuity of a semester or school year, to construct group learning experiences patterned on their own cultural milieu. Therefore, the cultural learning mechanisms of a society, outside the educational sphere, are adaptive to the social learning dimensions of CLL. They may be introduced by the teacher as "focused contracts" which Egan (1970: 61) calls exercises in group learning.

It is possible to classify the pertinent cultural mechanisms, in the Japanese case, on the dimensions of the social-value model. On the

primary vertical dimension are the cultural mechanisms of (1) the age-hierarchy and (2) the club-workshop *(Gasshuku)*. On the secondary vertical dimension are (3) the face-to-face group and (4) the interview *(Mensetsu)*. On the horizontal dimension are (5) the self-introduction and (6) the picture story *(Kamishibai)*. The first two cultural mechanisms were employed in an extracurricular CLL group. The others were used inside the classroom on the Junior College level with female students. The groups were primarily focused on the acquisition of oral English. Ongoing research may well demonstrate the value of this approach in other areas of English education, for reading, the mastery of grammar, and so forth. I would like to explain the derivation of these six activities and show how they can be used for foreign language learning, specifically English.

1. The Age-Hierarchy

Examples of cultural mechanisms on the primary vertical dimension of the social learning relationship are the Age-Hierarchy and the Japanese Club with its Workshop. According to Nakane (1970: 26), a hierarchy based on duration of service within the same group and on age rather than on individual ability is overwhelmingly important in fixing the social order and measuring the social values of a Japanese group. Nakane has written as follows:

> In Japan once rank is established on the basis of seniority, it is applied to all circumstances, and to a great extent controls social life and individual activity. (Nakane, 1970: 29)

CLL is also organized on a hierarchical basis. Curran (1972: 128-135) has distinguished a five stage hierarchy of language learning from the dependence of childhood to the complete proficiency of adulthood. The details of the CLL hierarchy and its effect on learning can be found elsewhere (La Forge, 1974; 1975 (a): 9-20; 1975 (b): 225-226).

2. The Club-Workshop

The Japanese age-hierarchy, for example, serves as the vertical

social structure for an informal learning group called the "Club." The club is a unique Japanese social entity with no counterpart in an American school. The extracurricular activities of a modern Japanese school are organized into small tight-knit social units of younger and older students. Clubs function throughout the entire school year on a hierarchical basis, the younger serving the older and learning from them. They operate on an allotment of funds from the students' association. Other than the restrictions of a budget and the advice of their staff counselor, the members are left to run their club as they see fit. Decisions concerning activities are made at the top of the hierarchy by the club captain and are then passed down the hierarchy where they are carried out by various other officials in minor roles. Because of its security, Japanese students prefer to remain in the same club throughout their school days rather than change from one extracurricular activity to another. All the graduates of a particular school are identified by the year of graduation and membership in some school club.

A CLL foreign language learning contract was once enacted in the Japanese cultural context of an English speaking club (La Forge, 1975 (a): 74-94; 1975 (b): 227-230). The members were approximately twenty-five junior and senior high school students. The club advisor, who functioned as a CLL counselor, assumed a role similar to the teacher in an ancient Japanese Fief school described by Dore (1965: 73-74). The English club was a close-knit social unit in which the age-hierarchy was fully operant throughout the school year. The older students directed the younger in various foreign language activities such as English free conversations, outings in the country, the use of the telephone, and English letter writing.

The enactment of the English speaking contract in the workshop demonstrated the use of cultural mechanisms for education. At every stage of the planning and execution of the workshop, the responsibility was divided among the older students. Decisions were made in collective leadership at the top of the age-hierarchy. They were left to be carried out by various lower-level students at the direction of the president himself or by other officials. The cognitive effect, for instance, of the acceptance and fulfillment of re-

sponsibility by the leaders of the workshop was their improvement in English speaking ability. This did not occur in the individual as an isolated incident or a mere cognitive phenomenon, but part of his total growth and development as he did his share of the work.

As a stipulation of the member contract, an English speaking rule was enforced with severe rigor during the workshop. In fact, it became a norm of social conduct sanctioned by a ritualistic system of rewards and punishments. When the group norm was violated by a member, who even inadvertently spoke Japanese, a fine of ten yen had to be paid. The culprit had to bow three times before the punishment box which was decorated and displayed in a prominent place. The culprit was also required to apologize to the group for the violation. The money collected in the box was used to purchase small awards for the outstanding performance of those who participated in the other English speaking activities of the workshop. In this way, the cultural mechanism of the workshop greatly contributed to the English progress of all the participants.

3. The Face-to-Face Group

The CLL social learning contract is enacted not only between the teacher and the whole group, but also between the teacher and each individual in the group. This is the secondary vertical dimension of the learning contract. The English activity is the face-to-face group experience, which was derived from a Japanese cultural learning mechanism. In the Japanese judo hall, members form a double line for *Uchikomi* (feinting practice) and *Randori* (standing tactics). For feinting practice, each member chooses a single judo tactic and feigns an opening attack on his opponent for a definite number of times. The number is counted off either between the pairs or by the whole group. Afterwards, all the partners are changed. For standing tactics, each member wrestles his opponent to the floor during a three minute period. Once the opponent is on the floor, the match is broken off and begins again from standing position. One of the lines is circulated so that each member receives a new opponent every three minutes. This is the way that judo is learned.

In the CLL class, the students are divided into two lines. They

"wrestle" with an English conversation for three minutes (*Randori*). Partners are changed every three minutes. The teacher also enters the line and speaks with each student for a short time. However, because of time limitations, it is usually impossible to speak with each and every member of the class. The teacher has made a gesture (*Uchikomi*) which is interpreted by the students as a valid expression of interest in each member of the class. The face-to-face group activity can be continued with great profit for more than thirty to forty minutes. The discipline of the time limitation frames the experience in such a way that the students are freed from inhibition and anxiety in the speaking experience. Although the activity is intensive and leaves the students fatigued, they appreciate the chance to meet with the teacher and each member of the class.

4. The Interview (*Mensetsu*)

Another example of a cultural mechanism on the secondary vertical dimension, between the teacher and the individual, is the interview (*Mensetsu*). If misunderstanding develops in a Japanese group, clarification of the social relationship can result by halting activities temporarily. The whole group is divided into small units for an interview with the leader. Issues which are troubling either the leader or the members can be discussed in private. Suggestions and modification of the group activities can be brought up and discussed in a secure manner. In its application to foreign language teaching, the interview can be held in the form of a game called "vanish without a trace" (*Yukue Fume*). The whole class is divided into small units for free conversation or some other English speaking activity. During the course of the activity, one group suddenly "vanishes." The teacher calls one of the small groups into a smaller room or office outside the classroom for the interview, which may last from five to ten minutes. The teacher returns to the classroom with the group and, in order to enhance the learning effect, he might engage in some form of role playing. He can assume the role of a worried parent and ask such frantic questions as,"What happened to all my children?" Since in our modern day every important person holds a press conference at one time or another during his career, the teacher might also assume the role of a news-

man and ask the group members such questions as, "What happened? Where did you go? Whom did you meet? What did you talk about?" The role he assumes and his manner of questioning serve to communicate the subject matter and atmosphere of the interview to the other members of the class.

5. The Self-Introduction

Learning also takes place on a horizontal dimension of the CLL relationship among the students themselves in small groups. The teacher does not participate in this activity, but stands by for assistance should it be required. The students are allowed to exercise the foreign language which they have already learned. A variety of cultural mechanisms can be used effectively in conjunction with small group activity.Two examples are the self-introduction and the picture story (*Kamishibai*).

One of the first activities of any Japanese social group is self-introduction, a ritual which is performed before a new activity even if the members have known each other for years. The self-introduction is an announcement of participation and a declaration of commitment to a group activity. It serves to bring an already existing group into the life of the present activity. As applied in the CLL context, the self-introduction is of utmost importance in establishing the basic learning contract. The class is divided into small units of four or five students. During a period of preparation, each student prepares his self-introduction together with the members of his group. He may use Japanese during the course of preparation, but the presentation of his self-introduction is made to the whole class in English. If he needs assistance during the course of presentation, the student may stop and ask his group. Through the self-introduction, the student establishes his English identity before the whole class. The other members recognize him because of his unique hobbies, interests, and motives for being in the class. The public commitment of the self-introduction is sacred to a Japanese group and can be appealed to if problems of flagging motivation appear during the course of the semester.

6. The Picture Story (*Kamishibai*)

The picture story (*Kamishibai*) is a Japanese cultural form of story telling which can readily be adapted to CLL small group activity. Each group is asked to compose a story in English. After the story has been corrected, the students depict the action on a series of about ten large picture cards. Once the dialogues have been matched with the pictures, each group presents its picture story to the whole class. American children would readily take to such a task, but a group of adults would consider it puerile. Japanese groups of all ages become deeply involved in the creative activities. The picture story is a valid form of Japanese cultural learning. The scenes depicted may be familiar Japanese scenes, but the people interact in standard American English. More often, the scenes will consist of some realistic facet of American life. In either case, the psychological process is more than cognitive, or even affective. The cultural imagination of the students is engaged in color and form. In this sense, the creative learning process of the picture story takes place on three levels, namely, the cognitive level in the composition of the story, the affective level by the creation of a plot which holds the attention and interest of the class, and on the imaginative level by depicting the story in color and form.

During the class presentation, the stories can be videotaped. After each presentation, the teacher is expected to make his own comments and give his impressions of the story. The videotape can then be replayed to the class by way of review. The class presentation, itself derived from a Japanese cultural mechanism, is called *Matsuri* (Temple Festival). The gala occasion or "Story Telling Festival" (*Kamishibai Matsuri*), can be made even more effective if it is accompanied by appropriate music. Students might not be willing to learn a page of dialogues from a textbook, but they have no trouble comprehending the dialogues of a picture story.

REFLECTION

Perhaps a major contribution of behaviorism to language learning was its stress on experience with language as the basic mode of learning. Recent research with CLL has shown the importance of reflection in the language learning process. By definition, the CLL

learning contract is enacted in supportive group reflection. Begin (1971: 119-120) has written as follows:

> The importance of the Evaluative Session can hardly be overemphasized. Man is not a mere mechanism capable of absorbing information; he is essentially an appraiser. When he is given the opportunity to appraise his learning experience, it restores his natural balance, which is often lost in the stress of speaking a new language. For participants in a group experience, it is a way to learn how to work together in harmony. When our students were evaluating their learning experience, they were trying to understand what it was doing to themselves or to other participants. They were allowing themselves to react to their experience as persons.

Group reflection is also an important cultural learning mechanism which can be found in Japan. Every social or working group in Japan sets aside a period for reflection at some time during the course of its activity. Reflection is considered necessary for the social function or learning progress of any group. In the Hirschmeier and Yui social value-model as operative in CLL, the ethics of functional role expectation were worked out during reflection periods. Hence, pressure generated by the group itself served to strengthen the individual who contributed to the group goal and to punish those who were lacking in motivation.

How does reflection contribute to language learning? According to Egan (1970: 75), research has shown that goals become operational to the degree that they are clear and to the degree that the steps or means leading to goal achievement are clear. The CLL-Japanese reflection period affords a group a chance to review and clarify its goals and progress in language learning. Egan (1970: 76) has distinguished five kinds of goals which are reviewed during the course of reflection: contract goals, interaction goals, process goals, content goals, and need goals.

Contract goals refer to all the provisions of a contract, e.g., the conditions and stipulations necessary for English learning. During reflection periods, which are held at the end of each CLL class, the contract goal of English proficiency—the purpose of the group—forms the focus of discussion. The Japanese cultural mechanism enhances CLL reflection and fixes the attention of the group on this key facet of its life. In this way the energy of the group is ex-

pended upon its main purpose, the mastery of English. At first, the reflection period was carried on in Japanese. Later, when the group came to realize that this was contrary to the basic contract, Japanese was replaced by English so that a new English speaking experience was born. As a result, more English was spoken during the reflection period than during the CLL experience period.

Interaction goals refer to different kinds of interpersonal activities which are forbidden or allowed members during the course of their contract learning experience. Because interaction goals are necessary for the fulfillment of the contract, they form the heart of the contract experience. An example of an interaction goal was the English speaking rule of the workshop, by which the members were to interact in English and not in Japanese. After the different types of small group experiences in class, students remarked that the variety of interactions allowed by the CLL contract gave them more chances to establish friendly relationships than in other classes of oral English.

Process goals refer to the kinds of activities essential to any group which desires to handle its business as a group rather than as a collection of individuals. Process goals are a type of contract goal. Their purpose is to make the group run more efficiently and with greater immediacy. Process goals refer to the way in which the group carries out its activity. During the reflection periods, the members review their personal motivation and report to the group publicly upon their performance. These reports tended to follow a four step pattern: First, statement and evaluation of personal performance; second, resolution for improvement; third, statement about the conditions of the group performance; fourth, suggestions for modification of the group performance or its activity. Students became quite candid in evaluating their personal performance: "I spoke much English today," or "I couldn't say much today." The reasons for the performance were also given: "I got up late this morning," or "I studied some new English expressions yesterday." Resolutions for improvement made publicly before the group, were taken seriously and could be referred to if confrontation by the teacher became necessary. Usually disciplinary problems were met when the student referred to the conditions of the group

performance. The following is an example: "Many students came late for class today, so it was difficult to begin at once. I think we had better come on time." Disciplinary problems brought up by the students as part of the reflection period could be handled more efficiently by the teacher.

Many suggestions for modification in CLL activities were adopted after the discussions during the reflection periods. In this sense, the content goals or the subject matter of the experience were reviewed during reflection periods. New types of Japanese cultural mechanisms were adopted, but only after discussion and even disagreement. When the students suggested that fixed topics be decided for each class, I argued for open topics. However, when the students persisted, they were asked to make a list of three topics which they considered important for discussion. These were graded according to the preferences of the students and a single topic was assigned for each class. Students were divided into small groups for this activity. They were also put in charge of the discussions, which were concerned with travel, friendship, school, parents, marriage, movies, sports, and so forth. Far from being a "sideways motion" or an "inauthentic transaction," in the sense of Jacobovits and Gordon, the disagreement with the students greatly contributed to their advance in learning, especially since the dispute was carried on entirely in English.

"Need goals" refer to the tendency of individuals to use a group for the fulfillment of their personal needs. During the course of reflection, the basic needs of a CLL group become clear. Therefore, the teacher is able to confront these needs as they arise. By allowing learner space to the students, their abilities and defects in the cognitive use of English become clear. Students also readily realize the need for correction during the course of a language learning experience. The Japanese cultural mechanism of review and reflection creates a social situation where the intervention of the teacher occurs at a time when the students need it most, and much more important, are prepared to accept it. Cognitive problems connected with grammar, pronunciation, and the mastery of new expressions are handled more effectively during the CLL reflection periods than during the experience periods.

Lastly, through reflection, the group is welded together into a "community" in Curran's sense (1972: 30). A community is not merely a group of individuals, as such, but also a living task-oriented experience between the knower-teacher and the learner-student. The term is also intended to include a self-involved and self-committed relationship to a group. Through the use of Japanese cultural mechanisms, the student begins to express the involvement by adopting personal pronouns—"my small group," "my role in our picture story," and so forth. This is a far different type of community relationship than that between a teacher and an ordinary class, especially when the teacher tries to convince his students that memorizing sentences from a textbook will contribute to their progress in English.

THE BENEFITS OF CULTURAL MECHANISMS

By way of conclusion, I would like to point out three important benefits of using cultural mechanisms in the context of CLL. First, English is learned through a living experience in a social medium which penetrates deeply into the consciousness of the learner. In its basic structure, CLL contains many elements which fit into the Japanese cultural pattern, especially in its contractual nature, its hierarchical structure, and its stress on reflection. Learning mechanisms which already exist in Japanese society easily fit into the scope of CLL activities.

The need for a living experience of language learning has been expressed by Harasawa (1974), who painted an extremely pessimistic picture of the English education scene here in Japan. Japanese culture has militated against English and other foreign language education. Harasawa stressed the absence of a sense of "livingness" of English as a language used by millions in their everyday lives. Japanese have approached English as something unreal, abstract, and highly artificial. Harasawa (1974: 74) has written as follows:

> It seems to me that generally speaking, our foreign language teaching has been conducted on the surface of their consciousness. In other words, ordinary Japanese learners have never really been able to convince themselves of the reality, the true 'livingness' of English.

Secondly, the educational process becomes centered around the teacher in a new way. Once the contract is set up and fully understood, the teacher is free to choose among the cultural mechanisms and implement them in what Egan (1970: 61) calls "learning exercises" or "focused contracts." The teacher uses himself as a free human instrument to promote learning between himself, the whole group and each individual in the group. If the vertical dimension threatens the students unduly, then the teacher may withdraw from the action temporarily and allow the learning to take place on the horizontal dimension among the students themselves. Effective cultural mechanisms on both dimensions allow this change of pace to occur in a flexible way. During the reflection periods, the reasons for the teacher's actions become clear to the students, who are psychologically prepared for the next learning exercise. In this way, the teacher is free in the CLL process to make personal decisions necessary for the direction of his students. He does not control the individual, but he controls the class activities and monitors the learning environment to his own effectiveness and the advantage of his students. The CLL counselor functions not only as a "sympathetic bilingual person" (Diller, 1975: 71), but as a teacher who must face a group of students and make decisions concerning the activities of his class.

Thirdly, through the use of cultural mechanisms, significant changes in attitudes and values occur among the students. These changes take place as a result of the impact of the CLL experience on both horizontal and vertical levels. In this sense, the Hirschmeier-Yui social value-model is useful not only for understanding the history of Japanese business, but also for understanding the dynamics of a present day Japanese CLL group. Through the CLL experience in the medium of Japanese cultural mechanisms, with its focus on the goal of English mastery, the contract goal is enacted as a value to be sought after by all concerned. The interaction goal, which encourages the establishment of positive interpersonal relationships, is transformed into an interaction value to be pursued in the group. Process goals, which refer to the motivation and action of the group, are transformed into process values, especially at later stages of CLL learning. As the students advance in self-

confidence, they can be corrected publicly without disturbing the flow of the group conversation either during the CLL experience or reflection periods. In this sense, process goals become process values through which the students eagerly seek correction for their English mistakes. Content goals, which refer to subject matter, are transformed into content values through adopting the suggestions of the students for a better class relationship. Once the students realize that their suggestions are being adopted, a flood of new ideas enlivens the discussions. Finally, need goals are transformed into need values by which the student realizes his own personal development in the English language learning experience. Through the use of Japanese cultural mechanisms in a CLL group, the involvement is achieved through open discussion of the issues involved in learning. The foreign language learning process becomes centered on values which are learned in a community.

REFERENCES

1. Begin, Y. *Evaluative and Emotional Factors in Learning a Foreign Language.* Montreal: Desclee & Cie/Bellarmin, 1971.
2. Berne, E. *Games People Play.* New York: Grove Press, 1964.
3. Curran, C.A. *Counseling Learning: A Whole Person Model for Education.* New York: Grune & Stratton, 1972
4. Diller, K. "Some New Trends for Applied Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching in the United States." *TESOL Quarterly.* 1975, Vol. 9, 65-73.
5. Dore, R. *Education in Tokugawa Japan.* London: Routledge & Kagan Paul, 1965.
6. Egan, G. *Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth.* Belmont. California: Brooks/Cole (Wadsworth Publishing Co.), 1970.
7. Egan, G. *Face to Face: The Small-Group Experience and Interpersonal Growth.* Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole (Wadsworth Publishing Co.), 1973.
8. Harasawa, M. "A Critical Survey of English Language Teaching in Japan." *English Language Teaching Journal,* 1974, Vol. 29. 71-79.
9. Harris, T. *I'm OK–You're OK: A Practical Guide to Transactional Analysis.* New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
10. Hirschmeier, J. & Yui, T. *The Development of Japanese Business: 1600-1973.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.
11. Jacobovits, L. & Gordon, B. *The Context of Foreign Language Teaching.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1974.
12. La Forge, P. "Community Language Learning: Findings Based on Three Years of Research in Japan." Paper presented at the First Japan Symposium of Sociolinguistics, Tokyo, August, 1974.

13. La Forge, P. *Research Profiles with Community Language Learning.* Apple River, Illinois: Counseling Learning Institutes, 1975. (a)
14. La Forge, P. "Community Language Learning: The Japanese Case " In *Language in Japanese Society: Current Issues in Sociolinguistics,* F.C.C. Peng (Ed.), Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press. 1975. 215-246.
15. Nakane, C. *Japanese Society.* Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970.
16. Stevick, E. "The Meaning of Drills and Exercises." *Language Learning,* 1974, Vol. 24, 1-22.
17. Stevick, E. Review of "The Context of Foreign Language Teaching" by L. Jacobovits & B. Gordon. *The Modern Language Journal,* 1975, Vol. 59, 452-454.

Operations and Their Use in the ESL Classroom

Thomas A. Winters *

Although operations as an ESL teaching technique seem to be fairly widely known, there are still many teachers who have not even heard the term. This article will 1) explain what operations are, 2) give an example of an operation and suggest a format for organizing one along with associated relevant material, 3) assess their general advantages (in terms of theoretical underpinnings) and what they are particularly useful for in teaching (which language structures and elements), and 4) point out some ways that operations can be used in the ESL classroom.

An operation is a set of directions, delivered in the form of commands, describing a process or procedure for doing something. It may involve the manipulation of a piece of equipment, such as operating a cassette recorder; it may aim at developing a skill, such as using a dictionary or studying for a test; or it may involve body movements, such as doing push-ups. It makes use of a natural sequence of events, and can be something as simple as lighting a

*Mr. Winters received his MAT in ESL from The School for International Training in Brattleboro, Vermont. He has taught ESL in Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, and Mexico, and has co-authored a handbook of operations for the ESL classroom to be published this year.

Acknowledgment: Many of the concepts and much of the language found in this article were worked out in conjunction with Gayle L. Nelson while engaged in writing a book of operations for the ESL classroom. The author would like to once again thank her and express his appreciation and gratitude.

candle or as complicated as making a paper airplane.

Let us take the operation of making a paper airplane as an example:

MAKING A PAPER AIRPLANE

Materials: Sheets of paper

Key words:

lengthwise	side	fold	crease	make
edge	wing	bring	lies	fly
		repeat	produce	test

Operation:

1. Fold a sheet of paper in half lengthwise.
2. Bring the top edge along the first crease and fold.
3. Repeat for the other side.
4. Fold again so that the 45 degree crease lies along the first crease.
5. Repeat for the other side.
6. Make a lengthwise fold to produce a wing.
7. Repeat for the other side.
8. Fly the airplane to test it.

Grammar notes: result clause
infinitive clauses of purpose

Related activities:

1) Have contests to see whose paper airplane will fly the highest and the longest distance.
2) Divide students into pairs and have them play catch with paper airplanes.
3) Talk about how real airplanes are made, flight (lift on wing surface, etc.), parallels with hang-gliders, any future space projects using this principle, etc.

A widely accepted format for operations is the 8 x 8, a series of eight commands, each one not exceeding eight words. This makes it easy for the students to grasp, as more and/or longer steps tax the students' memories. In more complex operations lines sometimes

exceed eight words, as in steps 2 and 4 here, but this operation would be used in a more advanced class, where students could deal with it more easily.

Apart from the operation itself, you will see other categories of things connected with the operation which would be useful for the teacher to have at hand. The first is a listing of the materials needed to perform the operation. Next comes what you consider to be new vocabulary words or words which you feel your students might have difficulty with. After the operation comes a note of the grammar points that the operation contains, and lastly, the classroom activities that the operation leads into or can be tied into, including discussion topics or different ways in which the operation can be adapted to work with other grammatical structures.

The use of language is central to the correct completion of the operation. If the instructions given are not correct, or the student does not understand them, he will not be able to successfully complete the operation. Language, therefore, is the medium that enables the student to complete the process, and the process is a vehicle for learning the language.

The meaning of the language is made clear by the action, and the action reinforces the language. There is, therefore, tactile and visual memory as well as linguistic memory. Operations are an effective way for students to actively use the language in a purposeful, functional way. Since the students are physically responding to the words, the language has concrete meaning for them.

Operations can be designed for specific student needs, such as using a typewriter, a slide rule, a language lab, or a library, thus increasing their motivation and retention. They can also be used to focus on cross-cultural skills, such as using a laundromat or finding an apartment, to facilitate a student's entry into another culture.

Operations are designed to supplement, not replace, the regular curriculum, and an appropriate operation can be used at any level of language proficiency. They add variety to the class, and students enjoy doing them. Since the students first observe the operation and then complete the process themselves, there is an element of repetition without dullness. Because operations are short, they can be easily covered in a class period.

Operations are compatible with a number of teaching methodologies. They have been and can be used with Audio-Visual Materials, Situational Reinforcement, Total Physical Response and The Silent Way, among others.

Operations are a particularly effective way of teaching and practicing verb tenses, especially the present, present continuous, past, future, present perfect, past continuous and future continuous. The verbs involved tend to be high frequency action verbs such as push, pull, open, close, take, give, let and turn on. The teacher can vary the tense of the verb phrase to fit the level of the class.

Operations can also be used as supplementary activities when working on intonation and stress patterns, vocabulary building, cultural information, word order, possessive pronouns, prepositional phrases of place, and adverbs. They are recyclable in that the teacher may use a specific operation once and then return to it later, changing the point of emphasis. For example, the focus in the initial presentation may be a particular verb tense, while the focus may be intonation patterns or result clauses in a later presentation.

The following is the most frequent way operations are used in the ESL classroom. The teacher should have the operation memorized. In the initial presentation, the teacher introduces the piece of equipment or materials to be used, pointing out the parts and introducing new and unfamiliar vocabulary. He then models the sequence of actions, demonstrating the use of the piece of equipment, making something, or doing some action.

For example, using the operation presented here, the teacher says, "Fold a sheet of paper in half lengthwise," and then models the action by folding the sheet of paper. The teacher says each line of the operation and performs the action involved until the operation is completed. Presenting the sequence again, line by line, the teacher checks student comprehension, emphasizing the specific verb tense or grammar point being taught. If the present continuous is the focus of the lesson, the dialogue might go as follows:

Teacher: Fold a sheet of paper in half lengthwise.
(The teacher folds the paper.)
What am I doing?

Student A: You are folding a sheet of paper in half lengthwise.

Teacher: Bring the top edge along the first crease and fold.
(He brings the top edge along the first crease and folds.)
What am I doing?

Student B: You are bringing the top edge along the first crease and folding.

Again the teacher models the complete sequence, asking questions at the completion of each step. After the operation has been completed the second time, the teacher may choose to write the operation on the board or pass out copies to the students. Next he leads the class through a choral repetition, listening for stress patterns, pronunciation or intonation.

Two students now model the operation. The teacher may want to write the sequence on the board or pass out sample copies to the students for this demonstration. The interchange between the students might go as follows:

Student A: Fold a sheet of paper in half lengthwise.

Student B: (Folds the paper)

Student A: What are you doing?

Student B: I'm folding a sheet of paper in half lengthwise.

Student A: Bring the top edge along the first crease and fold.

Student B: (Brings the top edge along the first crease and folds.)

Student A: What are you doing?

Student B: I'm bringing the top edge along the first crease and folding.

After the two students have modeled the entire operation, they switch parts so that Student A becomes Student B and vice versa. Then they model the operation a second time.

The class is then divided into pairs to perform the operation,

with each student taking a turn at giving directions and following directions. The teacher may interrupt with questions such as, "What is she doing?" or "What are they doing?"

After everyone has completed both roles in the operation, the teacher can erase the board and have students close their notebooks so they are unable to read the sequence. He asks the students to again perform the operation step by step, as well as they are able. They may use different words; this is fine as long as the meaning and correctness are retained.

The second person "you" has been used in the example; however, the questions can easily be varied by changing to the first or third person, singular or plural. One can also change the focus of the questions by using wh-interrogative words, such as "Who folded the paper?", "What are you doing now?" or "How will you test the airplane?"

Again, this is a sample of one way an operation can be used in an ESL classroom. As with all techniques, operations can and should be adapted to fit the style of the teacher, student needs and the particular classroom situation. They provide one more useful ESL teaching tool.

Practical Suggestions for Teaching the English Modals

James W. Ney *

The English modal auxiliaries can, may, will and must are best understood within a system which gives each of them two different meanings, depending on the context in which they occur. These meanings can be called the root and the epistemic meanings and can be plotted on a chart in the following fashion:

CHART I: The Meanings of the English Modals

Root Meaning		Epistemic Meaning	
may/might	'permission'	may/might	'possibility'
can/could	'capability' 'permission'	can/could	'possibility'
must/should	'necessity'	must/should	'hypothesis'
will/would	'volition'	will/would	'future prediction'

For most verbs, the epistemic meanings fit in the following environments:

1. With the progressive tense marker (be ... ing)
2. With the perfect tense marker (have ... en)

*James W. Ney is a Professor of English at Arizona State University.

Most of the other environments require the root meaning of the modals except as noted further along in this study.

Chart I, then, provides a system for teaching all of the meanings of the modals. For instance, the root meaning of may (permission) is best taught in the class situation.

Student: May I go now? Teacher: Yes, you may.

Notice that can also expresses the root meaning of permission in this situation.

Student: Can I leave the room now? Teacher: Yes, you can.

The past tense forms, might and could, add a degree of tentativeness to the requests for permission and, therefore, a degree of politeness.

Student: Might I go now? Teacher: Yes, you may.
Student: Could I leave the room? Teacher: Yes, you can.

Since in a student to teacher situation the student should be polite but the teacher does not necessarily have to be extra polite, it is more likely for the student to use the remote (polite) forms, might and could.

The epistemic meaning of may and might is best taught in making guesses about what some students who are not in class may or might be doing. The teacher starts a monologue about one such student in somewhat the following fashion:

Teacher: Yoshio is not in class today. Is there anybody in class who is able to make a guess at what he is doing?
Student 1: He may be riding his bicycle.
Student 2: He might be fixing his wagon.
Teacher: What might he have done when he was absent yesterday?
Student 1: He might have gone to the doctor.
Student 1: He may have had a stomach ache.

Again, the remote form might adds a degree of tentativeness to the meaning of possibility which is present in all of the instances of

may and might in this example. Notice also that all of the examples here are in environments where the epistemic meaning of possibility is expected; namely, the perfect and present progressive of the main verb.

Teaching the root meaning of can and could is best accomplished in a unit on sports or musical ability. Such a unit may be set up in the following fashion for the root meaning (capability) of can and could:

Kazuko can play baseball well now. She couldn't play well last year.
Seiji could play the violin well last year. He broke his finger and he can't play it at all well now.

In these environments, the remote form actually signals past tense. The same general situations can be used to teach the epistemic meaning of can and could.

Can Kazuko be playing baseball now?
Could Seiji be playing the violin now?
Kazuko could be playing the violin and Seiji could be playing baseball.

For reasons not fully understood, can and the progressive do not seem to fit well together in statements in English, although they are quite all right together in questions. With the perfect tense, can and could signal the past tense, but the epistemic meaning of possibility is still evident.

Could Kazuko have played baseball yeaterday?
Seiji could have played the violin yesterday.

The question asks, "Is there a possibility that Kazuko played the violin yesterday?", while the statement implies that there is a possibility that Seiji played the violin yesterday.

Since must and should signal necessity, they are best taught in a section on obligations that students have.

Mitsuo should obey his father.
Sumiko must obey the teacher in the future.

Again, since the remote form expresses a degree of tentativeness, should is not as strong as must in expressing the necessity of obligation.

As in the other forms, the epistemic meaning is expressed with the progressive and perfect tenses. Since for should and must the epistemic meaning is hypothesis, it is best taught in contexts where logical inferences are common, such as geometry or Perry Mason murder mysteries.

The villain must be leaving town on the next jet.
The police should be chasing him all the way to the airport.

As in the case with can and could, the perfect tense signals a past tense with must and should, which express hypothesis in this environment.

The villain must have left town by jet.
The police should have been chasing him all the way to the airport.

It is strange that should seems to depart from its epistemic meaning, hypothesis, and revert to the root meaning of necessity or obligation. The sentence with should have seems to mean, "The police had an obligation to chase the villain." It is equally strange that should and the perfect have signal a contrary-to-fact conditional. The sentence with should and have also states that the police did not chase the villain to the airport. If such a sentence is negated, it means that the action of the verb did in fact occur.

The police shouldn't have chased the villain to the airport. The sentence with shouldn't have states that the police did chase the villain to the airport.

Since will and would express volition, it is best to teach them in the context of future events.

I will be going to Mozambique next year.
I would be going to Mozambique if I could.

Here the root meaning of will and would (volition) is quite clear, but unfortunately it is not clear in all instances. In the following, would expresses habitual action.

I would go down there a lot last year.

However, true to the system presented here, will and would express future prediction with the progressive.

He will be going to Osaka next year.
He would be going with us if he could.

The tentativeness of the remote form would makes the fulfillment of the action in the verb unlikely, however. A similar phenomenon is observable with will and would and the perfect tense.

He will have finished his trip in three months.
He would have finished his trip a year ago.

The combination will have still expresses prediction in the future, but since the perfect tense with a modal expresses past time, the future prediction with would is a future prediction in the past. It also thus signals a contrary-to-fact conditional. The sentence with would have and a year ago clearly signals that he did not finish his trip.

Strangely enough, however, with copula verbs, the well laid out scheme in Chart I and the rules for understanding the root and epistemic meanings of the modal auxiliaries function a little differently. For those copula verbs which have one type of adjective in the predicate and function as action verbs, the scheme in Chart I yields the root meaning. For those copula verbs which have another type of adjective in the predicate and function as stative verbs, the scheme in Chart I yields the epistemic meaning in the present tense. The first type, corresponding to action verbs, includes items such as become (with any adjective), be strong, be happy, and others. The second type, which are like stative verbs, includes be ill, taste good, sound nice, seem sick, appear ill and so on. From this, it should be apparent that students must be alerted to the difference in the meaning of copula verb plus adjective sequences so that they can tell the meaning of the modals from the sentences in which they occur. Such a matter can only be taught by stressing the fact that some adjectives describe states over which humans have little or no control (statives) while other adjectives express states over which

humans have at least some control. Thus the sentence with Kazuko expresses the root meaning of the modal could (capability) since it is similar to the latter (action verbs), while the sentence with Seiji as subject has the epistemic meaning of could (possibility) since it is similar to the former (stative verbs).

Kazuko could be happy if she wanted to. (could=capability)
Seiji could be dead. (could=possibility)

Teaching this distinction is necessary for an accurate understanding of the modals.

Quite apart from the principled exceptions to the scheme in Chart I discussed above, the English modals show some strange behavior at certain points. Moulton (1966: 12) noted one of these quite some time ago. In particular, he noticed that have to and must have similar meanings in the affirmative but quite different meanings in the negative, as in the following sentences.

Yoshi must go to work today. (necessity)
Yoshi has to go to work today. (necessity)
Tachiko must not go to work today. (prohibition)
Namio doesn't have to go to work today. (negated necessity)

Not only does the negative have this peculiar effect on the modal must; it also has a similar effect on will after the auxiliary inversion and contraction have been applied to request sentences. Thus there is a marked difference in meaning between the following sentences:

Won't you please get into the pool?
(Please do get into the pool).
Will you please not get into the pool?
(Please do not get into the pool).

This same distinction exists for all the modals in request sentences.

Could I please not go to the party?
(I don't want to go to the party; please don't force me to go.)
Couldn't I please go to the party?
(I want to go to the party; please let me go.)

Such matters are of sufficient complexity that they should be

70

taught only to advanced students.

From the preceding discussion, it should be evident that the facts concerning the English modals should be taught gradually throughout the English program. Furthermore, if Hammerly's (1977) assessment for the teaching of French and Spanish can be applied to the teaching of English as a foreign language, then 80% of the grammar of English can be learned by induction and 20% can be learned by deduction. Undoubtedly, many of the facts concerning the English modals lie within this 20% and can be summarized using Chart I.

REFERENCES

1. Boyd, Julian and Thorne, J. P. "The Semantics of Modal Verbs." *The Journal of Linguistics*, 1969, 5, 57-74.
2. Calbert, Joseph P. "Toward the Semantics of Modality." *Aspekte der Modalitat.* Fubingen: Verlag Gunter Narr, 1975.
3. Ehrman, Madeline. *The Meanings of the Modals in Present Day American English.* The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
4. Fries, Charles C. *American English Grammar.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940.
5. Halliday, M. A. K. "Functional Diversity in Language as Seen From a Consideration of Modality and Mood in English." *Foundations of Language*, 1970, 6, 322-361.
6. Hammerly, Hector. "The Teaching of 'ser/estar' by a Cognitive Audiolingual Approach." *Hispania*, 1977, 60, 305-308.
7. Hofmann, T. R. "Past Tense Replacement and the Modal System." *Harvard Computational Laboratory Report to the National Science Foundation on Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation.* No. NSF-17. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University: 1966.
8. Huddleston, Rodney. "Some Theoretical Issues in the Description of the English Verb." *Lingua*, 1976, 40, 331-383.
9. Jenkins, Lyle. *Modality in English Syntax.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1972.
10. Joos, Martin. *The English Verb.* Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.
11. Keyser, Samuel Jay and Postal Paul. *Beginning English Grammar.* New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
12. Lee, D. A. "Modal 'Auxiliaries' in Generative Grammar–Some Pedagogic Implications." *IRAL*, 1975, 13, 263-274.
13. Marino, Matthew. "A Feature Analysis of the Modal System in English." *Lingua*, 1973, 32, 309-323.
14. McCawley, James. "The Category Status of the English Modals." *Foundations of Language*, 1975, 12, 597-601.

15. Moulton, William G. *A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning*. New York: The Modern Languages Association, 1966.
16. Newmeyer, Frederick J. "The 'Root' Modal: Can It Be Transitive?" Studies presented to Robert B. Lees by his students. Calgary: Linguistic Research, 1970.
17. Ney, James W. "The Modals in English: A Floating Semantic Feature Analysis." *The Journal of English Linguistics*, 1976, 10, 8-20.
18. Ross, John Robert. *Auxiliaries as Main Verbs. Studies in Philosophical Linguistics*. Evanston, Ill.: Great Expectation Press, 1969.
19. Seuren, P. A. M. *Operators and Nucleus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.
20. Twaddell, W. Freeman. *The English Verb Auxiliaries*. Providence, R. I.: Brown University, 1960.

English and Politics in Japan: Observations on Language Education Reform

Roger Pehlke *

People concerned with English language education in Japan have given less attention to policy-making agencies and processes than to the outcomes of the policies themselves. Much has been written about the defects in the educational system (Harasawa, 1974: 71-79).[1] Sociocultural, linguistic, and historical reasons why Japanese have difficulty in learning English are also well-documented.[2] Yet it is difficult to find many attempts to grapple with the question of why significant educational reform has not been forthcoming despite apparent public and professional discontent; or how and by

*Roger M. Pehlke is a Ph. D. candidate in Comparative and International Education at U.C.L.A. He is currently Principal of the Language Institute of Japan.

[1] In order of importance, this writer listed the five greatest defects as 1) the university entrance examination in which oral-aural skills are almost totally excluded, 2) the professional training of English teachers, 3) academic prejudice on the part of teachers, 4) language teaching methodology, and 5) the teachers' fondness for discussion of grammatical detail.

[2] Some of the more interesting works in these areas include: Takeo Doi, *The Anatomy of Dependence (Amae no kozo)*, 1971 – group consciousness; S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action*, 1972 – directive and affective uses of language; Hajime Nakamura, *The Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples*, 1960 – differences in logic systems; Chie Nakane, *Japanese Society*, 1970 – hierarchical societal structure; G. B. Sansom, *An Historical Grammar of Japanese*, 1928 – early development of Japanese language; Hiroshi Wagatsuma – various readings on cultural identity and Japan-U.S. relations.

whom specific actions might prompt decision makers to alter aspects of English language education where shortcomings have been consistently pointed out.

There needs to be among educators an awareness of policy-making and its relationship to foreign language education in Japan's formal school system. Research in this area is needed to aid classroom teachers or administrators, whether Japanese or foreign, to understand the system in which they work and/or the system which provided their students with the context for previous language learning. More important is that we gain the ability to foresee what kinds of policies we can likely expect in the future and, hopefully, how we can take part in creative reform.

This paper represents an effort to briefly explore some of the dynamics underlying educational decision-making in Japan. Focus is on those factors which might ultimately affect the content and structure of English language programs in the secondary schools. A basic assumption is that such an angle is a necessary addition to other lines of inquiry which seek change in the area of English language teaching/learning. In what follows, there is, first, a discussion of the demands for courses of study emphasizing practical, spoken English. Particular attention is paid to those demands articulated by *zaikai* (organized business) and their recent response to governmental inaction. Secondly, some obstacles hindering educational reform are considered. Emphasis is given to system-wide (educational system) characteristics which serve to inhibit change. A final comment touches on research needs in the field of educational politics as it bears on English language programs in Japanese schools.

ZAIKAI: HOW BIG A ROLE?

The Japanese educational system offers the largest single modern foreign language program in the world. English is an integral part of almost every secondary student's experience. As part of an educational system which represents for those students "the inner core of the ladder of success," (Passin, 1965: x), it is not at all farfetched to conclude that English competence is one variable related to

social and economic mobility in Japan. Who is making the demands that English occupy such a strategic position in the Japanese student's formal education? And why? The answer is undoubtedly multifaceted and not much studied as yet. One can assume, however, given the tremendous influence exercised in other areas of Japanese life, that organized business represents a major interest. The present system of Japanese capitalism has lent continuity to fundamental social and educational traditions which helped catapult Japan into the modern era at the end of the Tokugawa period (1603-1868) and at the beginning of the Meiji (1868-1912). Business is a major force in shaping today's educational system in Japan.

The business community's present concern over the importance of speaking and comprehending English (as opposed to translating and analyzing it) began in the mid-1950s. One area in which this can be seen is diplomacy. Since the mid-1960s, participation by businessmen in Japan's national diplomatic activities has been a constant phenomenon. It was in the mid-1950s, by which time Japan had fully recovered from the war and was looking vigorously outward for markets for the products of its burgeoning economy, that a systematic pattern of private economic diplomacy began to emerge (Bryant, 1975: 4, 8). Business leaders simply felt the need to take new diplomatic initiatives. In order to do so, English speakers were required. The year 1955 marked the first public warning for educational reform of English instruction to be sounded by business leaders. The educational department of *Nikkeiren* (Japan Federation of Employers Association) pointed out the inefficiency of English education in Japan, lodging complaints against the grammar-translation method of instruction and the necessity for teachers to "teach to the examination." *Nikkeiren* called for a new emphasis to be placed on teaching English for practical use.

The past 20-plus years have witnessed consistent and varied efforts by *zaikai* to influence English education in the direction of increased oral-aural work. Japanese industry gave substantial support to the founding of ELEC (English Language Exploratory Committee, though the name has since been changed to English

Language Education Council) in 1956. That organization was conceived and continues to be based upon the objective of improving teaching methodology and in-service training for secondary school English teachers (Takahashi, 1977: 92). Seven years later, business interests again joined forces with language educators in another scheme to encourage the practical use of English. The Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP) was established for the purpose of administering nationwide, competitive tests to measure English ability, again with the emphasis on oral usage. STEP has become vastly popular and certain schools and businesses today actually use the test results as a means of rating staff members. It is significant that both ELEC and STEP, as well as other efforts, have enjoyed the blessing and support of the *Mombushō*.

The momentum seems not to have decreased since those early years. Indeed, the year 1964 brought with it a milieu with added incentives for all Japanese to learn spoken English. That was the year when restraints on foreign travel, such as currency limitations and difficulty in obtaining passports, were lifted. At least one writer views 1964 as even more significant than the Meiji Restoration in its effects of opening up Japan to the outside. It marked the emergence of the Japanese world traveller (Umesao, 1974: 140). The recent strengthening of the Japanese yen carries further implications for increased travel and business opportunities for Japanese. The need for competence in English has thus continued to be recognized and even stressed more heartily in business circles.

The late 1960s, however, perhaps signalled an important departure from previous *zaikai* response. Japan's future education policy, argued the *Keizai Dōyūkai* (Japan Committee for Economic Development) in 1969, should not be formulated from an insular outlook but should take into consideration broader societal needs (Bryant, 1975: 8). Amidst other grievances expressed and reiterated by the business community on the issue of developing *kokusaijin* (internationalists), a major push was made by companies to build within themselves. A multitude of Japanese companies began, in 1969, to urge their employees to study English. Sony made such study compulsory. In-company programs and training seminars in English for senior executives began appearing in increasing numbers

(De Mente, 1972: 82-83). Other companies retained private commercial organizations to come in and instruct their employees. A study published in 1977 located 122 companies which claimed that they have English training programs. Of 146 respondents, 116 companies or 73% gave top priority to spoken English when asked to rank the four skills of hearing, speaking, reading and writing (Hashimoto and Lav, 1977: 72-75). The warning levelled by *Nikkeiren* in 1955 appears to have been heeded—in the form of company initiative. *Zaikai* interests seem to have taken a new and ambitious direction in the last decade, one that calls for minimal *Mombushō* involvement.

One can argue various interpretations of this turning inward for English language training by Japanese business. On the one hand, it could be posited that *zaikai* voices were not strong enough to engender fundamental change in influencing *Mombushō* policy. Meeting with failure, they turned to their own resources. On the other hand, ample evidence exists to indicate that the business world wields enormous influence on the educational system (Pehlke, 1975: 82-97). One writer states:

> It is a fairly safe assumption that if the English program had any direct effect upon Japan's economy, it would not last two months without being completely retooled or discarded.(Brosnahan and Haynes, 1971: 84)

The truth probably lies somewhere in the middle. The degree to which Japanese industry exerts pressure for reform on the formal school system may reflect the perceived strength of the relationship between the language education efforts of the public schools and their own needs. Despite substantial sway on the system, the business community and others are thwarted by numerous obstacles to which we will now give consideration.

OBSTACLES TO REFORM: THE SYSTEM

The *Mombushō* embarked on a bold course of recentralization at roughly the same time as industrialists began issuing pleas for instruction leading toward functional English. Justifying it as a move to equalize educational opportunity, the Ministry of Educa-

tion assumed new powers in 1956. This government control of the curriculum and textbooks has consistently been the target of vociferous opposition from the *Nikkyōsō* (Japan Teacher's Union), which views it as unnecessary intervention in the classroom. There is little doubt that the government's discernible swing to the right in education policy in the past two decades has inhibited reform of English language education. Today's Japanese English teachers widely agree that government-prescribed textbooks are uninteresting, in many cases too difficult for their students, and do little to inspire the oral-aural use of the language. Though the Ministry of Education exercises little control over the nature of entrance examinations, Ministry officials could have greater influence on the thinking of university authorities who are more able to affect change. Japanese teachers of English display limited optimism about the government's future actions and directions.

Such pessimism is understandable. There are those who claim they are witnessing a return to the indoctrination (in teaching) of the pre-World War II days. Nationalist tendencies in Japanese life (e.g., *tenchakuren*, or the "Dress the Emperor" campaign) are coupled by a turn away from internationalism in education (e.g., curriculum advising teachers not to go into detail in teaching about the United Nations) (Anderson, 1975: 338). It is therefore not surprising to read that Keiichi Miyazawa's (former Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Gaimushō*) prospects of becoming the successor to Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda are heavily influenced by his reputation in the LDP as ". . . an internationalist, able to converse easily in English and thus thought by some to be insufficiently Japanese" (*Far Eastern Economic Review*, November, 1977). Education plays a key role in forming national outlook, and vice versa. Historically, national outlook has been a determining factor in the direction that foreign language education takes in Japan.

The rightist leaning may also alter the rate at which progress is made in changing the entrance examination, often pinpointed as the central problem in Japanese education. Japan has maintained the prewar academic tradition of the boys' elite high school while simultaneously broadening educational opportunities for all (enforced during the American Occupation). Consequently, the

Japanese high school is predominately a university preparatory school resembling the European academic schools. Japan has met with conspicuous lack of success in dealing with the anguishing problems caused by this ambivalence between mass and elite education. The debate between former Diet member Wataru Hiraizumi (who called for an elite corps of fluent English speakers representing roughly five percent of Japan's total population) and Sophia University professor Shoichi Watanabe (who defended the need for teaching English to a wide segment of the school-age population) several years ago was a reflection of this dilemma in English language education. While alternatives to the entrance examination (such as a national achievement test) have been sought, the basic issue of screening and selection remains.

There has been a movement away from the progressive education which characterized post-war reforms and toward a more controlled, essentialist philosophy stressing the mastery of a large body of facts. In short, the focus today is on screening rather than the development of ability. The fact that teachers of English in Japan are in widespread agreement that the entrance examination undermines student motivation may be of only slight interest to those who are entrusted with the task of actualizing such an educational philosophy.

Governmental inertia is often at the center of inaction. The government, generally regarded as consisting of the three pillars of the LDP, *zaikai* and the central bureaucracy, has faced on numerous occasions a collaborative opposition capable of obstructing certain initiatives. These opposition forces–*Nikkyōsō*, *Kokuritsu daigaku kyōkai* (Association of National Universities), *Nihon gakujutsu kaigi* (Science Council of Japan), the press, students' associations, and opposition parties in the Diet–are usually unable to affect changes in *Mombushō* policies. Yet their concerted efforts can cripple government actions. Such a stalemate is hardly conducive to positive reform.

The present modes of decision-making, advising, and researching within educational policy circles also constitute obstacles to reform. It can be argued that assigning responsibility for policy results would lead to more deliberate and more thoughtful administrative

decision-making. In the Japanese traditional consensus system of decision-making, *ringishō* (proposal documents) are frequently drafted by lower administrators on the basis of their own narrow experience. Since the drafter is able to refer only to the past experience and precedents of his own office, there is certain to be a built-in lag between the contents of *ringishō* and the conditions of the outside world (Tsuji, 1968: 468). Old precedents dominate the process. Critics of this method frequently point out the public resentment that it stirs and brand it as a tyranny of the majority.

Advisory councils, generally known as *shingikai* (deliberation council) or *chōsakai* (investigation council) have been brought into wide governmental use. They were created with the intention of democratizing the formerly authoritarian posture of the prewar bureaucracy. Yet many view such councils as window dressing only. Japanese newsmen and popular critics describe the advisory committee system as "*kakuremi,*" (literally, "a cloak to hide behind") for the maneuverings of the bureaucracy (Pempel, 1974: 663). The *chuō kyōiku shingikai* (CCE, Central Council for Education), for example, has played a supportive role for the *Mombushō* or the LDP, seldom making proposals in variance with the prevalent thinking of the Ministry or the party in power. The Minister of Education is at liberty to appoint CCE members whose ideology conforms to the dominant views of the incumbent government; and the CCE is consulted only when the *Mombushō* feels so inclined. Neither the *Sōhyō* (General Council of Trade Unions), the largest labor federation in Japan, nor the *Nikkyōsō* have been able to gain access to the CCE (Park, 1975: 299). The result has been broadly based and in persistent opposition to the reform measures advocated by the CCE since it released its preliminary reports in 1970. The CCE, and other advisory boards like it, have been characterized by one author as being of the legitimization and co-optation varieties rather than the policy-guidance variety (Harari, 1974: 553).

Similar close in-group cooperation exists in the tendency to limit the scope of social science inquiry and cultural exchange *(bunka koryu).* Intensive, intergroup research is the exception rather than the rule. One writer makes this statement:

> Unless Japanese scholars learn to handle interdisciplinary research and problems and can join the other segments of their society in solving them, Japan's hopes for developing its knowledge-intensive industry will never become a reality. Nor will Japan take the place in international scholarship and cultural exchanges that the sum of its talents, individually considered, deserves. (Gibney, 1975: 553)

Social science research in particular, and joint research in general, remain largely untapped as a source of creative proposals.

International exchange, an activity that is closely related to English language education, receives minuscule funding from the government. Among the industrialized countries of the world, both the number of Japanese exchange students and the number of foreign students invited to study in Japan are dismally small. Japanese academicians engaged in research on foreign countries are also notorious for their complacency in remaining in Japan, never exchanging ideas directly with academicians from the country of their interest. Certain governmental guidelines exacerbate the problem. Only Japanese citizens may consider the possibility of becoming a full professor at a national university. Public teachers are government employees, and foreigners cannot hold government positions. Thus foreigners cannot teach English in the public secondary schools.

It is precisely these types of issues which become the focus of expressed desires for change of Japanese teachers of English today. They would like to have more foreign exchange students and more foreign teachers in their schools,[3] more government financial support for them to travel abroad, more pressure on university academicians to view research and the entrance examination in less parochial terms, and so on. Until a clearer notion of "*kokusaika*" (internationalization) emerges, social science inquiry and intercultural exchange will likely continue along similar lines and, in

[3]The *Mombushō* initiated a new program in 1977 for *Mombushō* Fellows, English-speaking foreigners who make visitations to the English classes of secondary schools and serve as consultants. While the total number of Fellows for all of Japan is under 20 this year, it represents a positive change. This writer has gathered numerous opinions of Japanese teachers of English during two consecutive annual summer workshops (1977, 1978) at the Language Institute of Japan in Odawara. Approximately 130 teachers attended each year.

turn, pose an additional frustration for those who view the need for deep-rooted reform of foreign language education.

PREDICTING POLICY DIRECTIONS: QUESTIONS

No one element in the political equation outweighs all others in determining educational policy. The demands of *zaikai*, perhaps the greatest single voice, are not always translated into policy. Even the CCE, which has always included at least a few representatives from organized business, has been lambasted by various spokespersons of predominant industrial thought as an inefficient entity which does not push *zaikai* interests strongly enough. The central bureaucracy and the groups which form a bloc in opposition are pitted against one another, each limiting the effect of the other. It is uncertain what is accomplished by proposals and resolutions submitted to the *Mombushō* from various English teachers' organizations such as *Zen'eiren* (National Federation of the Prefectural English Teachers' Organization), JACET (Japan Association of College English Teachers), *Eigo kyōiku kaizen shingikai* (Committee on the Improvement of English Education), or the numerous ELES (English Language Education Societies).

Uncertainties can be dispelled only if a closer look is taken at the policymaking process. Policymakers are primarily concerned with the identification of problems and with deciding on the degree of priority to be given their solution in light of current needs and resources and with regard to public sentiment or public demands. Numerous questions need to be raised.

- How are these policymaking tasks (as defined above) being achieved in relation to foreign language education?
- How significant is the one-quarter reduction in English class time in junior high schools (to commence in 1981) in terms of the priority English language education has been given in the overall context of secondary education?
- Who plays strong roles in the policy prioritizing?
- What channels exist through which organizations can effectively funnel reform notions?
- What are the various forces, influences, demands that have led to major reform in the past?

- To what extent do policymakers monitor and respond to public sentiment? (In Japan, little systematic attempt has been made by scholars to discuss the meaning of 'public interest,' a concept basically alien to Japanese society. (Harari, 1974: 556)
- In ignoring important sources of demands in forming foreign language education policies, what stresses are policy-makers perpetrating on the educational system as a whole?
- Which of the *Mombushō* pronouncements are meant to be operational and which are only exhortatory?
- How capable is the school system of implementing societal goals in terms of issues bearing on *kokusaika?*

These represent only a handful of the strategic questions which, if answers are found, should lead to significant insight into the future of English language programs in Japanese secondary schools and the overall purpose they are meant to serve.

An effort has been made here to delve briefly into some of the broader issues of educational policy-making which have a bearing on the reform of foreign language education (specifically English) in Japan. Credence has been paid to the impact of the business community on the educational system, though certain of the limitations to *zaikai* influence have been pointed out. Political and systemic obstacles to reform have been presented—an alternative means of inquiry to those centering on sociocultural, linguistic and historical factors. Questions were posed which indicate possible future research directions. Education's role in modernization and national development is a topic which has received considerable recent attention. Given the critical position that foreign language instruction holds for these wider concerns, it is paradoxical that policies surrounding such programs in the public schools have not been more closely scrutinized.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Ronald S. *Education in Japan: A Century of Modern Development.* Washington D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, U. S. Department of HEW, 1975.
2. Brosnahan, Leger and Haynes, Charles. "English Language Teaching in Japan: Two Views." *International Education and Cultural Exchange,* 1971, 6, 84.

3. Bryant, William E. *Japanese Private Economic Diplomacy: An Analysis of Business-Government Linkages.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.
4. DeMente, Boye. *How to Do Business in Japan: A Guide for International Businessmen.* Los Angeles: Center for International Business, 1972.
5. Gibney, Frank. *Japan: The Fragile Superpower.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975.
6. Harari, Ehud. "Japanese Politics of Advice in Comparative Perspective: A Framework for Analysis and a Case Study." *Public Policy,* 1974, 22, 553.
7. Harasawa, Masayoshi. "A Critical Survey of English Language Teaching in Japan." *English Language Teaching Journal,* 1974, 29, 71-79.
8. Hashimoto, Sadao and Lau, Larry. "A Survey of In-Company English Teaching Programs." *English Education in Japan,* Tokyo: ELEC, 1977, 72-75.
9. "Japan's Great Debate." *Far Eastern Economic Review,* November, 1977.
10. Park, Young H. "The Central Council for Education, Organized Business, and the Politics of Educational Policy-Making in Japan." *Comparative Education Review,* 1975, 19, 299.
11. Passin, Herbert. *Society and Education in Japan.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.
12. Pehlke, Roger. "Educational Zeal in Japan: The Sole of the Zaibatsu." *International Foundations of Education Quarterly,* 1975, 1, 82-97.
13. Pempel, T. J. "The Bureaucratization of Policymaking in Postwar Japan." *American Journal of Political Science,* 1974, 18, 663.
14. Takahashi, Genji. *English Education in Japan.* Tokyo: The English Language Education Council, 1977, 92.
15. Tsuji, Kiyoaki. "Decision-Making in the Japanese Government: A Study of *Ringisei.*" In Ward, Robert E. (Editor), *Political Development in Modern Japan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
16. Umesao, Tadao. "Escape from Cultural Isolation." *The Japan Interpreter,* 1974, Vol. IX, 140.

Book Reviews

THE COMMON SENSE OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. Caleb Gattegno. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc., 80 Fifth Avenue, 10011, 1976. Pp. viii + 223.

MEMORY, MEANING AND METHOD. Earl W. Stevick. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 68 Middle Road, 01969, 1976. Pp. xi + 177.

In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970), Thomas S. Kuhn argues that new ideas in science are not the result of cumulative knowledge but rather the result of looking at phenomena in a completely new way. Thus he argues that Einstein's work did not grow out of the work of either Newton or Copernicus. Rather, because Einstein's conception of the universe was totally different from that of Copernicus and Newton, he did not have to know anything about either of the other two scientists in order to develop his own theory. The reason new theories of science develop, according to Kuhn, is that theories in existence are inadequate in some way and cannot fully explain the problems that occur. New theories, new ways of looking at the world, new ways to solve problems, come about only as a result of a crisis in a particular field. Usually these new discoveries, these new insights, come from people outside the field or newcomers to the field, because those in the field itself have been so deeply trained in the point of view of one particular theory that they are unable to see that a crisis exists. They are unable to see that the view of the world they are working with does not adequately explain a great deal of phenomena.

Because *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages*, by Caleb Gattegno, presents a conception of second-language teaching that, as a totality, is different from others in existence, one can say that the work is revolutionary in Kuhn's sense of the word. This is not to say that there are not elements within Gattegno's system that have not been mentioned before. For example, his attitude in general, which is to give the students an opportunity to learn, is an

91

echo from Montessori. In *The Discovery of the Child* (1967), she says,

> If teaching is to be effective with young children, it must assist them to advance on the way to independence. It must initiate them into those kinds of activities which they can perform themselves and which keep them from being a burden to others . . . (p. 57).

Her emphasis on the teacher as an observer, too, is echoed by Gattegno. Likewise, Gattegno's emphasis on the importance of listening in Chapter 2 reminds us of Palmer's (1968) injunction to "wrap students in a cocoon of language." In the same way, Gattegno's emphasis on the similarities between the sound of different languages and in the sound-spelling correspondences of individual languages in Chapter 2 reminds one of those who have done so much work with the IPA of Sir James Pittman (1961) and his work with ITA. Gattegno's insistence that our task is to make students "make sense" out of the language (p. 33) and that "students must know they were right at a particular moment" (p. 124) sounds like Frank Smith (1975) speaking. His emphasis on little vocabulary and many structures and function words echoes Fries (1945) and Hornby (1959). When Gattegno uses the term "slices of life" (p. 141) referring to "Short Passages," the readers that he uses as part of his system, one is reminded of Billows' (1961) comment that the teaching of language is like the teaching of life itself, "slices of experience." In that Gattegno has students combine physical actions with things that they're saying, we are of course reminded not only of people like Asher (1966), who have done experiments on the effect of actions accompanied by speech, but also early British methodologists, such as F. G. French (1948), who consistently advocated activity on the part of the students. Even Gattegno's suggestion that translation can be extremely useful at a particular stage in language learning (p. 100) is obviously one that has consistently been made and, of course, is the way that some languages such as Latin and even modern languages were taught in many countries until very recently. However, though there are bits and pieces in Gattegno from other methodologists, the new way he

has put the bits together into a system and added his own ideas still makes his system original and, in Kuhn's sense of the word, revolutionary.

Because Gattegno presents a complete system–a theory and specific suggestions as to how the theory can be executed in live classes, as well as the exact material to be taught–it seems unfair to make a judgment of it in terms of other people's systems or other people's points of view. In the same way, it would seem unjust to judge Newton on the basis of what Einstein said. The only way to judge Newton adequately is to see the extent to which what Newton said about the universe is true. Some may in fact argue with some of the statements of philosophy as well as the particular instances of language that Gattegno teaches, but it seems to me that this is unfair. We cannot judge his work in terms of our own conception, or our own paradigm, but only in terms of his.

Though the system itself cannot be judged in terms of another system or a different point of view, comments about the style can be made. Gattegno himself, in his acknowledgments, says that his style is considered demanding by many. He simply suggests that it might be helpful to read aloud those sentences that seem dense to a reader. One could add Gattegno's own advice to language learners; to those who have difficulty with the style: Sleep on it! Since "not all learning takes place here and now, some may well be the outcome of sleeping on it" (p. vii).

There may be some individual sentences that are somewhat unclear to readers. However, in a book which is written to describe, as Gattegno says it is, "a summary of what I have learned over these years, and the latest statement on the subject I can make as a scientist examining the whole area of language learning and teaching," one would assume that there would have to be some individual sentences that would not be completely understood. However, it seems to me that the whole sense of the book is what is important to understand, rather than individual sentences on separate pages. Furthermore, two words that are used quite frequently in the book are the words "truth" and "will." Obviously, when words of this nature are being used, there is bound to be some lack of total comprehension on the part of the reader. All one can hope to get

when words like this are being used is a general sense of what the author is intending. To demand that words like "truth" and "will" be clarified beyond all doubt is to make a demand that as far as I know has never been achieved by anyone in history. If we believe, with Gattegno, that "communication is almost a miracle" (p. 19), we will be delighted when we do understand rather than depressed when we do not.

Comprehension aside, one can, I think, make the comment that the author has a great deal of zest for what he does as a teacher. He says that we must help the students "conquer" the new language. He says that the learners are "explorers of the unknown." One gets the impression that Gattegno is a guide who is delighted every time a conquest is made, no matter how many times he has seen it made. To him, learning a language is "an exciting adventure involving the whole self. All through our lessons it will shine by being given a central presence" (p. 10). Other statements he makes that suggest both his zest for his own as well as his students' learning and his understanding of students are statements such as "this exercise will free students . . . a teacher using this approach has access to the powers of the students" (p. 22).

Though he wants the students to make conquests, he understands the difficulty of any conquest, and therefore he says that one of the things that is vital is that students be "at peace with their utterances and their writing" (p. 17). Likewise, his respect for students is constantly evident. His chapter entitled "Independence, Autonomy, and Responsibility" highlights both his understanding of students and his respect for them. But these traits pervade the entire book. Here is a quotation which shows his zest, understanding and respect all together.

> . . .[the Silent Way] is the way of sensitive, responsible teachers who know that their job is to be on the side of learners. All the time. So that these learners relate to the language, to its demands, and to the rewards which came from finding their endowments capable of being used in another fashion which reveals to them the competent learner each of them is, or at least has been.
>
> Learning a language thus goes beyond acquiring new behaviors; it is one more step towards being a freer person. (p. 55)

In addition to conveying what Gattegno calls "the spirit of the Silent Way," he provides a great many suggestions for teaching all languages and a great deal of material for teaching English. In the Appendix he also provides some graded material for teaching French, Italian, Spanish and Mandarin. He describes in quite specific terms not only how to teach listening, intonation, pronunciation, structure, vocabulary, reading and writing but also literature. He also tries to dispel misunderstandings people have about the Silent Way. For example, he says in what is probably a shocking statement to those who have only passing acquaintance with his ideas that "the halo that has been attached to silence has to be removed" (p. 45). He also reminds the reader that the rods are not what makes the Silent Way important.

But these specific suggestions of what a teacher should do and what does and does not make up the Silent Way are not really central. I suspect his intention is beyond presenting these specifics to add to your teaching. He constantly warns us against single suggestions that are not part of an attitude. He refers to such suggestions derisively as "bright ideas." Rather, I think the intention of the book is to suggest that you completely alter the game that you are used to playing in the classroom. While some of the suggestions for teaching aspects of the language may be helpful, the desired effect that Gattegno seeks will probably not be achieved unless one adopts a totally different view of the game we usually play in a language classroom, or, for that matter, in any classroom. Constantly Gattegno makes statements such as, "the student is now as good as the teacher in that area" (p. 71). This confidence in the power of the student and this ability to relinquish the authority that we usually hold in the role of the teacher is ultimately what this book is about. And though he talks about the teaching of language, obviously he is talking about the relations between teachers and students in the classroom. Of course, the book itself can only suggest the kind of attitude that is necessary, just as books on morality can only suggest ways that people should act.

At first sight, Stevick and *Memory Meaning and Method* and Gattegno and *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages* seem poles apart. Stevick has been as familiar in the field as Gattegno

has, until recently, been unfamiliar. Stevick is largely responsible for Gattegno's present familiarity. References in Gattegno's book are non-existent while Stevick's book contains scores of references from articles on amnesia through flatworms to Zen. Though Gattegno is interested in experimenting with his ideas, he is in the last analysis an advocate of one system, his own. Stevick is an investigator who aims "for statements that will respond to those elements of soundness and truth which are to be found in any method that has survived long enough to have received a name" (p. 103). Gattegno tends to be absolute while Stevick is tentative: "I'm not sure of course. But the following are my best guesses" (p. 107).

But, look at the similarities. They both are practicing teachers, materials developers and learners of languages. The writing of both of these teachers grows out of what they themselves do all the time with students and teachers in classrooms. And because Stevick has found the widely accepted conceptualizations of language learning and language teaching inadequate he, like Gattegno, is a revolutionary in Kuhn's sense of the word. Because Stevick supports his original, elegant conceptualization with references to a great many others, some might argue that his work is a refinement and development of major trends in the field. But this conclusion is unwarranted. Stevick does *not* build his conceptualization on his references. Rather, he suggests the inadequacy of some and shows how others lend support to his own views. As he says in the Preface,

> . . . What I have written here is a personal credo—a statement of beliefs which existed in embryo before I went to the library, but which have become clearer, stronger, and in some respects quite different during four years of reading and experience. (p. xi)

That it is a personal book there is no doubt. The author reveals himself more than most authors of books in the field. In a discussion of the motivation teachers have for entering the profession, Stevick suggests that one of the reasons many enter language teaching is that as native speakers they already know the language and thus have a feeling of mastery of the subject matter to be taught. He follows this observation with a personal comment indicating that this was surely a factor in his own motivation in

becoming an English-as-a-foreign-language teacher (p. 75). In another personal comment he makes this statement:

> I personally feel toward research very much as I feel towards motherhood: I'm in favor of it, I respect it, I hate to think where we would all be without a certain amount of it; but I am biologically unequipped to perform it. (p. 106)

Though the personal nature of the book is pervasive, it is particularly highlighted in his section on method.

> This chapter (on method) is a letter from a traveller . . . More than the other chapters in this book, it is written in the first person singular because it describes the view through the eyes of one man. (p. 105)

Of all the sections in the book, this one on method, in which Stevick presents *his own* conceptualization of language teaching and learning, is the finest. Reading it first might make it easier for many to see why information in the first sections is presented.

Though Stevick's work is one that gets beneath the surface of what teachers and students do in classrooms and thus shows the complexity of the task of learning and teaching languages, it does so in the same way that a fine ballet dancer makes leaps look easy. In spite of the fact that a great deal of energy, concentration, work and thought go into elegant conceptualizing and leaping, the results appear effortless. In a frontispiece to the book, John B. Carroll comments on both the style and content of the book by saying it is a book to be read "curled up by the fire on a rainy day, for meditation, entertainment and renewal." It is also good reading on the subway, in a library, a park or a staff room.

A danger we face when we are reading books like Gattegno's and Stevick's, books that present rather complete, original, conceptualizations, is that we try to relate bits of what the authors say to things we already know. This of course is natural. It is the same principle that operates when we hear a foreign sound and we produce it following the sound patterns of our own language. Stevick's central point is that "the crucial factor in second-language learning is the quality of the personal activation" (p. 122). Reading this, it is easy to say, "Oh, Stevick is restating what people have

been saying for centuries, we have to involve our students." The reason that one needs to read the book is to realize that in fact Stevick is not just talking about involvement anymore than Gattegno is just talking about listening, silence, rods or tying actions to statements. Both Gattegno and Stevick are talking about total conceptualizations of language learning and teaching. This is why even though one can think of others who may have mentioned some points similar to ones these authors do, their works are still original: they shape a great range of ideas that others may have thought or said here and there into totally new, coherent and comprehensive conceptualizations.

Even though the books have to be read to understand fully the conceptualizations and their development, the main points of the books can be stated. Stevick himself (1974) has described the central points of Gattegno's first book on foreign language teaching, *Teaching Foreign Languages, the Silent Way* (1972). He provides another description in Chapter IX of *Memory Meaning and Method.* Stevick lists the main points of his own book in italics in Chapter VII. They include the following five principles:

> Principle I: Language is one kind of purposeful behavior between people. And language behavior is intertwined with other kinds of purposive behavior between people.
>
> Principle II: The human mind learns new behavior rapidly at any age. But (many kinds of) learning will be slowed down when the learner is busy defending himself from someone else.
>
> Principle III: Help the student to stay in contact with the langu ge.
>
> Principle IV: Help the student to maintain wholesome attitudes ... by reducing "reflectivity," increasing "productivity" on as many levels as possible, and by teaching, testing and then getting out of the way.
>
> Principle V: In preparing materials, make it easy for teacher and students to follow Principles I to IV.* (pp. 122-123)

*Stevick has recently reproduced twelve original poems that are designed to follow Principle V. The collection is called "Short Texts for Intermediate and Advanced Students of English as an Additional Language." The text contains a page of suggestions for use based on Principles I-IV in addition to the poems. His purpose in distributing the texts is to "glean the experience of ... colleagues" who use the poems.

To obtain single copies for reproduction, send a self-addressed envelope to Earl Stevick, 3412 N. 15th St., Arlington, Virginia 22201 with postage to carry two ounces.

An even shorter summary is provided in this statement: "I have tried to explore 'what happens inside and between folks in a language class' more thoroughly and more systematically than hitherto" (p. 124).

But while presenting brief descriptions or quotations that contain the major points may be helpful to get a general sense of the books, they provide nothing of the essence of the works. There is no way to summarize adequately books that treat subjects deeply. You must share the authors' development of their conceptualizations. And to do this you must read their works, reread them, and do some of the things they explicitly suggest and their words imply. You must then reread them, do the things they suggest again and, after looking carefully at what you have done, compare your teaching not only with the suggestions, but more vitally, with the spirit of the books, and the conceptualizations of teaching and learning languages that are presented.

Though these two books do contain specific suggestions, these books are not for you if you are interested mainly in prescriptions. These are not cookbooks with recipes so much as books on cooking. Using a few of the many suggestions they contain or imply will not do justice to the authors and their intentions. Their intentions are beyond this. These books are written to help us change our views of ourselves and our relationships with our students. They are calling on us to act completely differently, to alter completely the usual rules of classroom interaction. These books are saying that new conceptualizations of teaching and learning languages are needed because the ones presented so far are inadequate; there is a crisis in the field! Just as Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* called for a new government, not for tinkering with the relations with the crown, so Gattegno's *The Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages* and Stevick's *Memory Meaning and Method* call not for an alteration here or there but for revolutions, in Kuhn's sense of the word. They are not telling us to spruce up the holes we are in; they are telling us to dig new holes! If you are ready to dig, buy the books.

REFERENCES

1. Asher, James J. "The Learning Strategy of the Total Physical Response: A Review." *The Modern Language Journal 50* (1966), 2, 79-84.
2. Billows, F. L. *The Techniques of Language Teaching.* London: Longmans, 1961.
3. French, F. G. *The Teaching of English Abroad.* 3 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
4. Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1945.
5. Gattegno, Caleb. *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way.* 2nd ed. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc., 1972.
6. Hornby, A. S. *The Teaching of Structural Words and Sentence Patterns: Stage I.* London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
7. Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 2nd ed. London: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., 1970.
8. Montessori, Marie. *The Discovery of the Child.* Trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, S. J. New York: Ballantine Books, 1967.
9. Palmer, Harold E. *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages.* London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
10. Pitman, I. J. "Learning to Read: An Experiment." *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts 109* (1961), 149-180.
11. Smith, Frank. *Comprehension and Learning: A Conceptual Framework for Teachers.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
12. Stevick, Earl W. "Review of *Teaching Foreign Languages: The Silent Way.*" *TESOL Quarterly 8* (1974), 3, 305-314.

— *John Fanselow* *

*John Fanselow's original involvement in teaching ESOL began with two years' experience with the Peace Corps in Nigeria, followed by similar experience in Somalia, Senegal, and Togo. He then did graduate work in TESOL which led to his present position as coordinator of the teacher preparation program in TESOL at Teachers College, Columbia University. He is the author of *Teaching English in Exhilarating Circumstances.* This review originally appeared in TESOL QUARTERLY (Volume 11, Number 4, December, 1977) and is reprinted here with permission of the author and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

The Language Institute of Japan (LIOJ) is a non profit language school located in Odawara. LIOJ specializes in intensive, month-long residential English programs for Japanese businessmen and university students. In addition, the school offers weekly classes to the citizens of the Odawara area in English, Spanish, and French. Annually, the school also offers a week-long summer workshop for Japanese teachers of English. All of the programs at LIOJ are designed to help promote better cross-cultural communication and to encourage international understanding.

Publications in addition to *Cross Currents*

Teaching English Pronunciation to Japanese Students by Toneko Kimura
(A text and tape designed for use primarily by Japanese teachers of English, but very useful for non-Japanese teachers as well.)

Pronunciation 1 by Toneko Kimura
(A text and tapes designed for home study.)

Conversational Components: Intermediate by Elizabeth Harmon
(A text and tapes designed to build listening comprehension and oral fluency for the student who already has a command of basic English.)

Inquiries concerning LIOJ's publications or the school itself should be directed to:

The Language Institute of Japan
4-14-1 Shiroyama
Odawara, 250, Japan

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

_____

Please enter my subscription to *Cross Currents, 1979:*

_____ Vol. VI, Numbers 1 and 2 ¥2,400 ($11.00)

_____ Vol. VI, No. 1 (only) ¥1,200 ($5.50)

_____ Vol. VI, No. 2 (only) ¥1,200 ($5.50)

Payment enclosed _____

Please bill me _____

Payment within Japan may be made directly to us via a special delivery cash envelope *(genkin kakitome).* If you request billing, a postal transfer form *(yuubin furikae)* will be enclosed for your convenience.

Payments from outside Japan can be made via International Money Order made payable to *Cross Currents.*

* *

I am also interested in receiving information about the following:

_____ previous issues

_____ submitting an article

_____ other (please specify) _____

* *

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Cross Currents
Language Institute of Japan
4-14-1 Shiroyama
Odawara, 250, Japan